This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES
3 3433 08248017 3

RISTIANITY DID
NOT PREVENT THE WAR

ISAAC J. LANSING, D.D.

1. Eng, 1910 — Addresses, [illegible]

WHY CHRISTIANITY DID NOT PREVENT THE WAR

ISAAC J. LANSING, D.D.

WHY CHRISTIANITY DID NOT PREVENT THE WAR

BY
ISAAC J. LANSING, D.D.

NEW YORK
GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY
839599
ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS
R 1919 L

Copyright, 1918,
By George H. Doran Company

Printed in the United States of America

PREFACE

THESE addresses were not a series. They were occasional. If they have not surface sequence, they do have essential connection in their purpose to give light and strength to our people as aids to victory. All of them were spoken as sermons at home. Then, being called for, were repeated and somewhat expanded. They were given to Preachers' Meetings in New York, and to various clubs, among them the Rotary Club, the New York Republican Club and the Lawyers' Club of New York. In March, 1918, several of them were spoken to the eight thousand public school teachers of Chicago, and at various times to numerous popular assemblies. Everywhere they were called for in printed form and it was urged that so prepared they would multiply their influence for good.

The Rotary Club of New York published one, circulating thousands of copies. My honored and generous friend, Mr. Edwin O. Grover, President of the Prang Art Publishing Company, New York and Chicago, out of patriotism

and friendship, at his own expense printed some thousands of copies of three addresses.

The New York Republican Club prints another in its series for 1917-18; and the Lawyers' Club another in the Report of their Annual Meeting for 1918.

Now, the George H. Doran Company, whose devotion to the Allied Cause has given the world an unsurpassed contribution of invaluable patriotic books and pamphlets, undertakes to print these nine speeches together, hoping thus, as I also hope, to aid to victory.

This book is not prepared or sent forth as literature. These are War Discourses, to rouse the spirits of men, to assist correct thinking, to formulate clearly war issues and to inspire the stern justice of battle.

Every paragraph has been tested practically on uncommonly intelligent American audiences and approved by them in ways encouraging to the author.

With diffidence because of their incompleteness, with confidence as to their truth and with hope of their usefulness, the author gladly presents them to the larger public and invokes the blessing of God upon them as a force for Righteousness and Justice among mankind.

CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	Why Christianity Did Not Prevent the War	11
II.	The Antagonism of German Political Philosophy to Christian Truth and Morals	40
III.	The Angels' Song, As They Said It	74
IV.	The Doctrine of Jesus About Resistance to Evil	84
V.	The Perils of a Premature Peace	99
VI.	The Wisdom of Men that Was Foolishness with God	141
VII.	Spiritual Aims and Gains of the Nation	162
VIII.	Prohibition and National Defence	199
IX.	Our Victory Assured	228

WHY CHRISTIANITY DID NOT PREVENT THE WAR

I

Why Christianity Did Not Prevent the War

THAT was a thrilling incident told by a prominent American journalist of his experience in August, 1914, at a little French railroad town which he named. He told it somewhat like this:

"We were on a causeway over a wide street and there were troops marching in the street below. It was an embarkation depot. My companion, scion of a noble French house, had long been known to me as a man of the world, a daredevil, with never a thought of God—cursing, swearing, reckless, doing about everything that a man ought not to do. Here he stood beside me in a dirty military uniform, looking steadily into my face and listening to the tramp of the marching host below. Suddenly there came a great darkness, and I said to him, 'It is dark all over Europe to-day'—(there was an eclipse of the sun).

'Yes,' he answered, 'but darkest in France.'

Then he leaned out over the parapet of the causeway, where he could see the soldiers marching below, and taking off his cap he swung it in the air as he shouted to them in thrilling tones, 'God save France!'

And the soldiers of the French Republic, possibly atheistic once like himself, now praying to God with him, sent back the answer in thundering tones, 'God save France!'" In their heroic distress they had turned back to God and learned to pray.

It is good to know that in time of trouble many do turn to God and begin to pray. They feel the great need of His help and presence for strength and comfort. The horrors of this war have given to many a burden greater than they can bear. There are brave, broken-hearted men and women, and multitudes of innocent boys and girls who know not how to carry their burden of perplexity and pain. They need all the help that we can give them and that which only God can give besides. Many bewildered are asking, "Why did not Christianity prevent this war?"

I

One prominent religious editor who was a member of the Peace Conference assembling at

Constance, Switzerland, as the war broke out, returning to America immediately in August as the war began, wrote extendedly in his paper on the "collapse of Civilisation," a phrase which became common at the time. In a leading editorial which was republished by the Church Peace Union as having their sanction, he said: "Already thousands of atheists are being made; almost every other man we met in Europe this last week has shaken his head in sadness and said: 'What is the use of Christianity if it cannot stop this war?' You will notice that without marked dissent or explanation, this editor lends to the inquiry the force of his own uncertainty when he speaks of thousands of atheists being made in Europe, as though it might be expected that such a war occurring in the world, naturally cast a doubt on the existence of God. These seem to be convinced that there can be no God provided things occur as they have been and are now occurring. They shake their heads in doubt and say, 'What is the good of Christianity if it cannot prevent or stop this sort of thing?' evidently having in mind that Christianity ought to have prevented or stopped 'this sort of thing.' And inasmuch as it has not 'stopped this sort of thing,' Christianity is not what we have supposed it to be. Therefore, it being so visibly defective

and impotent, we cannot put our trust in Christianity as we have done heretofore. We believed that such a war was impossible, because we believed in Christianity. Now Christianity has failed and therefore the war is upon us."

It is not by any means clear to me that these ready doubters ever did put their trust in Christianity to prevent war or to do anything else, but rather were quite indifferent to it until they saw a farther opportunity to asperse it. One of the most distinguished publicists of the United States in a signed article which I have in my hand, published within a few months after the war began, writes thus in a high class and widely circulated journal: "Early in the progress of the war, thinking people in all the civilised countries are asking themselves what the fundamental trouble with civilisation is and where to look for means of escape from the present intolerable conditions. Christianity in nineteen centuries has offered no relief, and so called mitigations of war are comparatively trivial."

Proceeding, he seems to make this argument and draw this inference: Christianity has been nineteen hundred years in the world the enemy of war. If Christianity had been an enemy worth reckoning with, in nineteen hundred years it would have done something. As a matter of

fact it "has offered no relief." It is amazing that a grave and thoughtful man could make such an assertion or draw such a conclusion. He had just been round the world on a peace mission. Had he relied on Christianity to offer relief from war as he proceeded on this tour? Unless the above statement of its uselessness was an afterthought, he had not appealed to it. If he had not, it was because he had, before the war, decided that the influence of Christianity was so inappreciable that it was not worth appealing to. But if he did this, it was because he was an enemy to Christianity, which indeed he has shown himself to be, and therefore his adverse testimony is of little account. If he ever had the idea that Christianity might offer relief and mitigate the horrors of war, he had concluded that nineteen centuries had been long enough for the experiment and that Christianity is no longer to be counted on. To what then did he look, in his tour and later in the interest of World peace? Perhaps we may learn from the fact that, continuing the article above quoted, he affirms that our hope and our dependence must be in and upon International law applied to the nations of the world. But may we not inquire if there is not now a great body of International law? If it has not been in actual existence and in active

application for centuries of time? And it is presumably good law with as much force in it as any good law has or can have? It is good in the sense that it is eternally right, humane, moral, wise. If Christianity, however described and defined, has been a failure in preventing war, so has International law, and that not because of its defects or uselessness, but because it indicated lines of conduct and practise to which men and nations have given assent and approbation, but to which they have not given obedience in practise. International law has failed because it has been set at naught. There are no advantages in law except from *obedience* to it. And the same is true of Christian precepts.

A considerable number of critics of Christianity became vocal shortly after the war began, who never had indicated prior to that time that they had any special knowledge of Christianity; nor have they since. Take certain essayists to whom has been given a leading place in widely read magazines, and you will find that while known in some lines, they have never been recognised in the world of thought or information, as being qualified to speak on the subject of Christianity.

There is no doubt that the destruction of life and property on such a colossal scale as we are

now witnessing, by this war was not only a fearful shock to all people but has been an occasion for some to seriously, albeit confusedly, question the existence of God. The dreadful slaughters, massacres, devastation of thousands of towns and cities, the flying fugitives, the desolation of millions of homes, all the wreck and ruin of war have horrified our minds. Shuddering over the awful destruction, the suffering and loss, the myriads destroyed and incapacitated in numberless ways, some may impulsively raise the question, "Can it be possible that there is a God? Is all this consistent with the existence of a good and wise and almighty God?" Evidently it is the greatness of the suffering and destruction, in quantity immeasurable and in quality inconceivable, which raises the doubt.

But let us ask another question, one which did not come up in 1914 but which has been before our eyes for succeeding centuries. It is about a perfectly well known agency of misery and destruction which we have observed and taken more or less responsibility for, and which has wrought far more horrors than this war. Of this curse of human kind, the great English statesman, William E. Gladstone, said that it had destroyed more human beings than war, famine and pestilence combined, in the historic ages of the

world. This he said of the manufacture, the sale and the use of alcoholic liquors. No doubt he stated the plain truth. This present war in all its horrors and destructions, is far behind the liquor curse in the misery it inflicts on mankind. Now tell me how it happens that people who have been patrons and apologists of the liquor traffic, have never assumed it to be inharmonious with the existence of a good God that such destruction should go on? How did they come to the opinion all of a sudden, that God is an undesirable and unnecessary person in the world because of the killed, wounded and missing of this war, when the killed, wounded and missing of the liquor fiend had been so many more than those of war, in plain view of the people, for ages and ages of time?

The truth is that they dare not deny that men, not God, create and perpetuate the liquor traffic and that men can stop it. The same is incontrovertibly true of war. The mistake has been in assuming, as regards this war, that because a great calamity is not fully explainable when it suddenly falls, therefore God has not been or has ceased to be in authority over the world. For if the sum and aggregate of human misery gives any reason to doubt God, we would have much more reason for disbelieving in Him for the last

five hundred years on account of the liquor traffic, than we have in the last three years on account of the war in Europe and the world. But we know of the one and no less of the other that men, not God, make and perpetuate the liquor evil and no less the evil of war. Neither gives the slightest ground for accusing or doubting God, or for plunging into atheism.

In this connection I may remark that some have found a degree of comfort even in the war by saying of it that it is a war to destroy war and therefore is to be looked upon as having not merely a destructive but also a conservative force. They might add that if the war were waged for the destruction of the liquor evil, and successfully, it would save more of everything than it has cost. So it looms up in sight, as blow after blow is struck at the drink evil, that human right action against it, long ago known to be essentially the application of Christian principles and teachings, will thus save more lives, rehabilitate more manhood, and womanhood, deliver more childhood and create more property, in a very short period of years, than all that have been destroyed by the war. What men do and refuse to do let us not make a ground of accusation against God nor an occasion for unbelief in Him.

II

For what is true of Christianity is true of the moral law of the Ten Commandments which while incorporated in the body of Christian law, were given to the world in the form of a code fifteen hundred years before the coming of Christ. We may safely affirm that the moral law has been imperative in the world for a minimum of thirty-five hundred years. Why then has it not prevented vice and immorality? Is it because the Ten Commandments are in any wise deficient? These are highly commendable laws of human conduct. They bear the marks of a wisdom in their Author, which knew mankind and what was most advantageous for it in human action. The Moral Law is God's law as also Christianity is God's law and Gospel. The law is not impeached by continued immorality, nor is Moses, nor any who upon this code have built the statutes of states. It is a sublime code and comprehensive of duty toward God and man. Why then have not the Ten Commandments of the moral law prevented the vices which they prohibit, when they have been known and operative in the world for three and a half millenniums? The answer is perfectly clear. Hear and ponder it. Vices here forbidden prevail because men in their practise have been disobedient to that law.

Would you then repudiate, repeal or ignore the moral law or would you call on men to repent and to obey it?

The reason why we have adultery in violation of the Seventh Commandment is not because of defect in the commandment. The reason why we have murder in violation of the Sixth is not on account of any defect in this or lack in either of these two, or in the whole code. When obeyed they always work well and issue in individual and social benefit. The reason why when we have an invaluable moral law and notwithstanding its existence, vice and immorality still exist, is because the moral law has been ignored, disregarded, disobeyed, unapplied in the life of men. The just statutes of enduring civilisations are built upon the moral law as one of the most powerful and constructive of forces in the human world order. Shall we turn away from these laws? Shall we accuse them of bringing no relief to the moral world? This is folly.

We are comparing Christianity as a doctrine of life from God, with the Moral Law from the same Author, given to men with the like benevolent purpose. These alike, we may say, are directions prescribing human conduct and neither is less valuable in itself because violated, nor are they to be discarded because men have violated

them. On the other hand their value and power are attested by obedience and even by disobedience, since such disobedience has proven disastrous. The nature of things and the Author of the nature of things are on the side of both. We cannot call either institutions, although upon the law and the gospel institutions may be founded.

Quite likely the critics of Christianity may be regarding it as an institution with varied organisations, methods and formulas. This does not appear to me to be a fair view of Christianity any more than the organised state appears to be a test of the Moral law which it does not obey. The Christianity of Christ is not comprehended or limited by an establishment, an ecclesiastical order or a ritual. But wherever the Person of Christ is revered and loved, where the word of Christ is open freely and taught and known, where the works of Christ are done and the spirit of Christ shown, there is the Christianity of Christ; and where these are not it is lacking.

But even conceding something of an institutional character to Christianity, shall men be allowed to assume that because such an institution exists in the world and does not prevent war, therefore institutional Christianity is to be distrusted? By no means.

The family is an institution, literally such,

which has been in the world since the first beginnings of the human race. The family, the home antedate all other human institutions. Not only on account of the esteem in which it is held by all human beings but for many other rational considerations, it is conceded to be invaluable to man and society. Why then is it that in all ages, past and present, the family has failed to bring to the human race the benefit and bliss which are in it? Why has not the marriage institution glorified all families everywhere in the course of the ages past? The answer is not that it is incapable of making such improvement in human society. Everybody believes that the family at its worst is better for the social order than promiscuous associations at their best. But the truth is that the law of the family has not been kept and the family relation has not been sacredly employed to make it what it has the full power to become, and to exhibit its full influence.

If we concede for the sake of argument that institutional Christianity so called is real Christianity, and if we reason that this institution has not done what its claims would demand from it as preventing war, shall we then conclude that the institution is a failure and no more to be reckoned with as a preventing force? Use the same sort of an argument about the Family as

an institution: Why has not the family prevented war? Is not its whole spirit and tendency toward unity, fraternity and peace? It is far more widely recognised than the church and valued by millions of families who do not know or esteem the church. And yet it has not prevented war. Therefore as it has been tried and found not to have afforded appreciable relief, it should be discarded for International Law, or something else! And since, as evidenced by nature and history, God ordered and ordained the family, because it has failed to prevent war, are His wisdom and even His existence to be doubted and denied? And shall we hereafter turn to some form of organisation of human society other than the family? Is this reasoning? Or is it unreasoning prejudice? If the laws of the family are obeyed and its duties properly performed, it tends naturally and, doubtless, by divine appointment, to love, patience, consideration, sacrifice, altruism. And the reason why the family has not accomplished all it might in society, in the state, in education and in civilisation, is because it has not been used according to its purposes and laws. If this reasoning does not make apparent that neither Christianity nor the family has been expressed as it seeks to be, I might add another link to the chain of correct reason-

ing by saying that the whole force of the family would naturally be spent against the drunkenness which has been one of its destructive foes. And yet this scourge has prevailed over the family with most deadly destructiveness. Still the power of the family must be relied upon to turn men from false and unnatural appetite in the long run. The family institution is censurable only when unprized, misunderstood and undeveloped.

The like is obvious in many other directions. There have been books and literature in the world we know not how long. Might we not raise the question, Why is anybody illiterate when literature and possible literacy have been in the world for thousands of years? We answer, because most people have not valued nor devoted themselves to learning and literature. Education, schools of all grades, text books of very many kinds have long been accessible to mankind. Evidently they have been a worthy product of the intelligence of men and their use is in harmony with the nature of man and the will of God, tending to the uplift of society and the betterment of the race. And how persistently have we been assured that the certain effect and influence of modern scientific education, alleged to be the best to which the world has ever had

access, was to render war unlikely and indeed to make it impossible. The increase of knowledge, the cultivation of reason, modifying and controlling prejudice and passion, the self control of an educated mind were affirmed to be positive barriers to the madness of war. Over against this we have beheld that nation which has so specialised in education that its schools have been used as models for the world, a nation having relatively few inhabitants who were not schooled, and a people peculiarly strong in the vaunted scientific education, giving the lie to this whole theory, by wickedly and inhumanly plunging the world into the most destructive war in human history. On this great fact in detail, I do not now comment. But if its apologists and sponsors told the truth, Germany as the result of education, should have put an end to war and brought in the reign of reason and self control. And now shall we hear them say that education in many centuries has afforded no relief to war and that therefore, we must turn from it as unworthy of our confidence? This is much too broad a conclusion. If the education had been according to the laws of the mind and the heart, if it had taught as fundamental the love of God and the love of man, we should have found it, as applied to life, a powerful check on war, instead

of finding it an accelerator of ferocity and slaughter. The fault lies in the application of the learning obtained. Let me insist on and reiterate the fundamental principle that it is the application of the laws of morals, the institution of the family, the knowledge of duty and life, and, just as truly, of Christianity which alone can warrant the expectation of its legitimate effects being produced on human conduct and society.

May I put the argument in so simple a form as this: Since soap and water have been in the world for thousands of years of time, why is anybody dirty? It is not the fault of the soap and water, because soap and water mingled on the human skin will make it clean; but many have not felt the need of cleanliness sufficiently to make the application, and even yet with multitudes, it is difficult to inspire them with the desire to be clean. Where is the fault? Where the deficiency? Not surely in the soap and water.

III

Have I not arrived at a point where I may conclude that in assuming that Christianity ought to have prevented this war, we may be assured that it certainly would have done so if it

had been applied? What have we meant by Christianity? What characteristics do we assume that it possesses? Do we regard it as a magical power that lays hold of men irrespective of their preferences, their resolutions, their volitions, their characters? Or do we mean that the possibilities of all good are in it if men will espouse and apply it? A fair consideration affirms this, that the effects of Christianity in any reasonable and fair sense have always been conditioned on its use and application. The value of it to one or many depends on obedience and use by the persons to whom it is brought, and if they do not so apply it, they cannot experience its benefits.

The critics who assume to tell us all about Christ in the scheme of the world are quite likely to speak approvingly of the "Sermon on the Mount." They profess to believe it and are almost ready to grant that they can find no fault at all in it. Often they have been heard to say, "If you only let us have the Sermon on the Mount, we do not care what you do with the rest of the Bible." In this degree only I am prepared to agree with them, that in the Sermon you have great and precious teaching. And I suggest to these that they read it through. Let us turn to the climax of the Sermon. I suppose that the great Master of men and assemblies

intended to end it with a statement worthy of the majesty of what He had said before. Here is His closing thought and word:

"Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man who built his house upon a rock; and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell not: because it was founded upon a rock.

"And every one that heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them not, shall be likened unto a foolish man who built his house upon the sand; and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell: and great was the fall of it."

Christ declares that if any one is to derive advantage from this great sermon or from any of His teachings, he must both hear and do these teachings, and so build his character on this foundation as the house was builded on the rock. Whatever some college presidents and certain editors may think about Christianity, it is fair enough to give our Lord Himself an opportunity to tell what He means by it. If you go to any portion of the Divine Word, you will find that both He and those who immediately represented Him declared that the value of all that they do and teach to the hearer depends wholly

on the application of it which he makes to himself.

Take even that most tender and sympathetic word, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets and stonest them that are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not. Behold your house is left unto you desolate."

Here is the condition given by the Lord and Master Himself of getting the value out of Christianity. And if the foregoing lament was emphasised within seventy years of the time it was spoken, by a tragedy so terrible that it can be compared with the war tragedy of to-day, we may well believe that giving heed to the warnings against the neglect of the conditions which He has stated, can alone give efficiency to His mercy and grace. They are such that men had best confess in the presence of God that the only failure of Christ's doctrine is the human failure to apply it to life. Instead of assuming to dethrone the Judge of all the earth, men would better humble themselves before Him and apply the rules which He has given them for the guidance of individual, national and international conduct.

IV

"Why Christianity did not prevent this war" is a question dependent for its answer on another, namely, "Why did Germany accept the theories of Nietzsche and Treitschke, which are in utter and avowed antagonism to Christianity?" Who will answer? For the personal and political philosophy of these two, absolutely irreconcilable to Christianity, are the theories which the German Government is now applying and working out. The philosophy of individual life, ascendant and controlling in Germany, is that of Nietzsche. The accepted political philosophy is that of Treitschke. Both are wrought into the mind and life of the German people by the Government, the army, the universities, and schools of all grades. Nietzsche (born in 1845, died in 1888), Treitschke (born in 1834, died in 1895), lead and control the thinking of Germany. The mental concepts of both were largely ruled by atheistic, materialistic evolution and earlier Prussianism—the Prussianism of the eighteenth century, which adopted it as furthering imperial policy. The applied theory was expressed briefly in the accepted axioms of such evolution, "the struggle for life" and "the survival of the fittest;" the "struggle for life" being the method

of living and the "survival of the fittest" indicating the actual consequences of the "struggle." These gave to Nietzsche the idea of his "Superman" and to Treitschke, his "Superstate."

The "Superman" is the product of evolution and the incarnation of "might," superior to his fellows and likewise superior to all limitations excepting his own self assertion. His "will to power" and the exercise of it, gives him the right to do as he wills. All morality as commonly taught, held and practised, Nietzsche called a "slave morality." He identified himself with this "Superman" and declared himself a God. The weak, the crowd, aroused his contempt. The "Supermen" have only to think of themselves and the masses only serve their ends.

Egoism is salvation. He blesses the doctrine of inconsiderate self assertion. He declares that "an altruistic morality in which the ego and its self-selection is restrained, is in any case an evil, blighting morality." The Superman has every license in asserting himself.

Nietzsche hated Christianity. Christ taught "thy will be done:" Nietzsche, "my will at all costs." Christ sacrificed Himself. The Superman may sacrifice the world for his good. Woman serves no higher mission than that of a plaything for and a breeder of the Superman.

War he glorified: kindness, mercy, humanity he despised.

Treitschke, the political philosopher of most commanding control in German thought, was at first contemptuous and averse to Nietzsche's thought; later he accepted his doctrine not for the individual but for the State. The State, that is Prussianised Germany, was to be the "Superstate." In the struggle for life among the States, Germany had won, and in "the survival of the fittest," it was proved to be the "fittest." All other States were to be overpowered and Germanised by the German army. What Nietzsche's "Superman" was to be among men, Treitschke's "Superstate" must be among states. All other nations, inferior and despised, were to be ruthlessly overpowered and Germanised. The State is supreme; from it there is no appeal. To this view Treitschke came early in his career, from much more liberal tendencies, after he had been given a professorship by Bismarck in the university of Kiel. For thirty-five years he devoted his powerful, his unsurpassed talents to training the students, the scholars, the teachers, the captains and military masters of Germany. He taught that the "Will to power" and "Might" are the sole State morality. War is the manifestation of these, ruthless war. Treaties

have no binding authority. Spying and lying, inhumanity, savagery are all justified by the will of the State. Weakness in a State he blasphemously declared to be the sin against the Holy Ghost.

These two as master teachers, Germany accepted and followed. Their teachings were adopted in theory and pursued in practise for thirty years before the war of 1914 to which they were daringly leading. Prussianism found in them the prophets and in their principles the pilotage on the course to world empire. Christianity and all its laws of righteousness, morality, self control, peace, humanity, in a word everything Christian, Germany repudiated, travestied and despised. Germany accepted this anti-Christian theory of life and lived it. And so they prepared their plan of conquest and then flung themselves upon the world, to prove their doctrine and to enslave mankind. Rejected thus by the leaders, teachers and rulers of Germany what could Christianity do to prevent this War? Nothing could have prevented it except to have made such thinking impossible, which was itself impossible. All that was left to Christians throughout the world was either to lie passive and be destroyed or to defend all the fundamental principles of right life in the most active man-

ner and by the only method available, namely, Defensive War. And that is a plain reason why Christianity could not and did not prevent this onslaught of barbarism and fiendishness and why it met their attack with adamantine resistance.

The answer is complete and final.

V

But the proof is not all in. It remains to add one more unanswerable reason why Christianity did not prevent this war and could not prevent this or any war under similar conditions.

That reason is found in the true philosophy of life which is that of Christianity, and of peace as a consequence of Christianity.

Before the war a powerful leadership in the interests of peace had grown up which neither regarded nor was built upon Christianity. They had told us of peace as though it were a vital entity in national well being, the chief desideratum of national life. Many who became prominent in it as the apostles of pacifism of this kind, were not known as believers in Christ or Christianity. The peace sentiment which they fostered had come to be looked upon as so great in mass and so influential as to be in its very character and quantity, a defense against war. In

various ways they had demonstrated the value of peace; economically, commercially, humanely, racially, financially. There was a widespread feeling that peace was so buttressed by all these reasonings, so manifestly advantageous, that war was improbable and indeed out of the question. Immediately, when this fair fabric of their dream collapsed and vanished, those who had taken the burden of its promulgation were profoundly dismayed and disappointed, we may say chagrined and humiliated. And the inquiry naturally became rife, "What is the matter with this trusted peace programme that it has been as weak as water in the face of resolved war?"

The matter was this: Precedent to peace in Christian doctrine and philosophy, is Righteousness, without which going before, we have no well founded basis of peace. "The Kingdom of God is righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit;" more fully stated "Righteousness in the Holy Spirit, Peace in the Holy Spirit, and Joy in the Holy Spirit." In Christian philosophy Righteousness always goes before and antedates Peace.

You know that the basis of peace in any life is the rectification and direction of that life in harmony with the law of God.

You may construct your life in accordance

with any other philosophy and fail to attain peace, but if the principles which govern your life are the laws of God, and the righteousness of your life is approved of God, you have peace. "The wicked" who turn away from God "are like the troubled sea which cannot rest." "There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked." And although this truth is far older than the hypothesis of evolution, older than prevailing philosophies, older than the record which is given us of it, it is now as virile and as mighty as unchangeable law can make it, and as sure as the emphasis of God by ages of proof can make anything. "There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked."

If you wish to lay the foundations of peace in individual or community life, you will never accomplish it by waving the white flag, nor by protesting against slaughter, nor by reasoning about the wastes of war or presenting realistic pictures of horrible battle fields; you will only get it by teaching the Divine standards of Righteousness, from which, and from which only, can flow the condition which we name peace. When you become assured of the prevalence of Righteousness, you are assured of peace. For peace is not passivity or stagnation, not inaction or colorless quietness, but is rather the most intense, harmonious, constructive, co-ordinated benevo-

lent activity. Such a peace is impossible without keeping the law of God which is the law of right and is the condition of all human Righteousness.

If by peace we mean the absence of conflict, conflict arising out of opposition to evil, when and where in the Christian scriptures was any hope ever held out that this is possible or desirable? And where in the sacred writings is such compromise with evil held up as the goal of Christianity?

The necessary and eternal order in which peace comes to man and society is that it springs from and follows Righteousness as a cause. That Righteousness is a state of human character which is devoted to being right and doing right according to a universal, Divine and eternal standard of Right. The standard Right by which all right and righteousness are measured is Right as God wills it, reveals it and sanctions it. It is not mere obedience to numberless precepts, but a spirit in man, expressed in his actions. That spirit is the disposition of the man in union and harmony with God, the Holy Spirit. Of such Spirit and such Righteousness, love to God is the primary fruit and manifestation, and love to man the secondary and always present concomitant. Where this Righteousness prevails, Peace follows as the unfailing consequence.

This, briefly stated, is the Christian way to Peace, real and permanent, and absolutely the only way. Until Nations are righteous by compliance with God's standard of Right no secure and unbroken peace can reasonably be expected and none can be achieved.

Because the Germans and their allies rejected and repudiated Christianity is the reason "Why Christianity did not Prevent this War."

II

The Antagonism of German Political Philosophy to Christian Truth and Morals

THE action of Germany in precipitating this war greatly surprised and startled mankind. As the Teuton assaulted Belgium and France our wonder gave place to amazement and astonishment, succeeded by horror and execration, and these feelings continually intensified, have increased as the Germans have developed and fought to execute, through inhuman savagery, their long-prepared scheme of world domination. Such barbaric expression of the life and character of the German nation was totally unexpected by most of us. That a people whom we regarded with entire good will and credited with many kindly virtues should deliberately make such war, should be so immoral and unfeeling, so treacherous and cruel, so egotistical and rapacious, so religious and so pagan, we could barely credit and cannot yet understand. Our good will for them has not been wholly destroyed. We have condemned but do not hate them as

we try to understand their contradictions and misdeeds.

In seeking to account for their conduct and to justify against them the most universal antagonism of mankind, we feel that we accomplish little by merely giving way to violent denunciation of their actions, though these deserve our severest condemnation; and consistent with our former good opinion of the German people, we seek explanation, if any there be, for actions which, by every law of morals and humanity, we execrate and abhor. In the spirit of fairness, not to be destroyed by our unequivocal hostility to their behavior, we have sought to account for their misdoings. May I detail some of the assumptions which we have made in our endeavor to place in an intelligent light our explanation of the actions of which Germany has been guilty?

I

We at first assumed that this brutal, bloody, inhuman savagery is the work of the purely military party. These we discriminated from the people at large. They might have dragged the nation unwillingly into the war. But from the first the nation has been at one with these military leaders. The state as a whole is entirely military

and has never hesitated to adopt and execute the policy of its General Staff, lending its full and united strength to all their plans and deeds.

Then we assumed that the rulers are responsible and that they deserve all the condemnation, supposing that the people had not formulated or agreed to their policy; especially has the Kaiser been held responsible, as the incarnation of evil, the inspirer of war. But the nation at the beginning and ever since, and now, has unitedly supported its rulers, and this support has been given by Germans of all classes. The political philosophers have honored and defended their rulers; the theological faculties have endorsed them; the most distinguished university professors and scholars have commended them; masters in science have lauded them; the whole body of writers and artists have praised their course. These various leaders have issued manifestoes to the world fully upholding their rulers and applauding the national action. Spiritual leaders like Eucken, intellectuals, a numberless host, the Socialists, who previously denounced the war, have given steady and uncompromising support to their rulers without excusing or apologising for them in any particular.

We have assumed that the people were blindly and ignorantly following these leaders and that

when once their eyes should be opened they would revolt and withdraw. But we must remember that the German people are the most educated in books and by schools of any nation of the world. They have given to many lands systems of learning, from kindergarten to post-graduate universities; they are not ignorant and blind for lack of schooling. They are a learned, not an ignorant people.

We have assumed that when the German people had received knowledge of American aims, of the motives of the Allies, of what free government really means, they would fall away from their governing bodies. The President of the United States in a long and able message fully assumed this; so that multitudes of men declared: "If only this Presidential message can be placed before the German people they will be severed from autocracy, will revolt and establish free government and so end the war." But now, after three years of war, there is scarcely a trace of such revolution, nor is there any reliable information, however much we may desire it, showing signs of ferment or revolution in political Germany. This dream of ours is a vain dream. Germany is not on the verge of uprising or of revolution any more than Britain and France have been in their cabinet changes.

We have assumed, and sometimes declared, that the Germans are insane; that they are obsessed by hallucinations which sanity would repudiate; that they are running amuck; fanatics among the nations; a mad dog in the streets of the world. But we know that despite their atrocious wickedness, this is not true. They are not insane according to any proper definition of insanity. It has been suggestively said, and with some truth, that the German scholarly mind "begins by assuming a large premise which has no foundation, and then reasons with irresistible logic to a preposterous conclusion." This may describe a mental habit, but it does not describe the insanity recognised by experts as mental irresponsibility. We do not believe the German nation to be intellectually insane.

We have assumed that autocracy as a scheme of government is now making its last stand against the world flood of rising democracy, and that this war is to bring the end of kings, at least of autocratic kings. But we, not the Germans, have assumed this. They revere their autocracy. they have had great material prosperity under it, as we have had under democracy. Their history is a record of remarkable advance under the government which we condemn. Since Frederick William, ruling from 1713 to 1740, and Fred-

erick the Great, from 1740 to 1786, they have made their gains, and almost unprecedented gains they are, under the very form of government which now controls them and for which they now unitedly stand and heroically die. That government has held to the theory of the State as the army, the army as the State, and the reigning house claiming divine right to rule is honored and revered, if not loved, with all sincerity to-day.

Besides, in our assertion that democracy is the only form of government suited to popular advantage, we really have not chosen a popular watchword. First of all, most of the people of America when they think of democracy mean not the general definition, but think of the American Democratic Party. They do not objectise the idea of the rule of the people. Besides, we do not define democracy clearly. We declare as if it were final, that "all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." By this we justify popular government. Do we mean the consent of all those under its sway? There is no government, no republic, where all the people in it consent to its sway. Do we mean then that in a democracy, government derives its just powers from the consent of a majority? But a majority is only a

part of those governed. It may be but slightly over one-half; it may even be a minority that administers the affairs of the republic. The truth is that no government has just powers unless they come from those universal and eternal laws, not made by majorities or voted or amended by legislatures, made and announced by the eternal God; laws which no legislature dare assume to amend or repeal; laws of morals and humanity; of universal duty and benevolence. So, then, our expectation of the complete passing away of autocracy before democracy is not an intelligent conviction or an adequate clarion with which to arouse our republic to battle against overthrow. And, remote from democracy, the autocracy of Germany has always been and now is a powerful form of government.

We have broadly assumed that now the end of kingly rule is near at hand. But Great Britain, Belgium and Italy are not contemplating this as a result of the war. They have kings now and expect to have them hereafter.

We have made much of the assumption that military preparedness was the cause of the war. We must, however, face the fact that nations wholly unprepared are in the war, battling for life and liberty, conspicuously ourselves. America has evidently proceeded on wholly false theories

of Germany's action until this day, of which those assumptions which I have sketched are among the most prominent. None of them, nor all of them, satisfactorily account for the war. Yet what is more necessary than to penetrate to the exact causes which have created the present world-wide catastrophe and which are threatening destruction and chaos at the present time? What has made Germany a pirate among states, a murderer, a monster?

II

Allow me to assume and later prove that German political philosophy, into the acceptance and full belief of which the German nation has been drilled for many years, is the actual and adequate cause and explanation of its actions, apart from which it is neither adequately understood nor properly antagonised. To simplify it so that I may discuss it clearly in the time allowed, let me affirm and later demonstrate that this is a strife between two philosophies, two systems of thought, two codes of morals, mutually exclusive and irreconcilable; two views of humanity and of religion, of man and of God.

I ask you to consider the antagonism of Ger-

man political philosophy to Christian truth and morals, as indicating what we fight and what for.

So long as Germany holds the theory which created this war, so long she will fight to carry it out. The theory begins and ends in the avowed right and purpose of Germany to subjugate all other nations and to dominate the world. Let me disclose their theory by a concrete presentation of it.

The greatest and most influential political philosopher of Germany during the last century is Heinrich Von Treitschke. He, more than any single character in German political life, was responsible for the intense anti-English sentiment that flamed out in the Boer War and he is ruling the thought of the German nation, as developed at the present time. His ideals and theories, his hatreds and persuasions precipitated this war. Born in 1834, his father a soldier, Von Treitschke was destined for the army. An illness in his youth, which deprived him of his hearing, diverted him to scholarship and the study of politics. His heroes were the heroes of Prussia, and having distinguished himself in the schools of learning, at twenty-five years of age, he delivered his first course of political lectures at Leipzig in 1859. Out of this grew his treatise on the State.

From the beginning he was impressively popular. Later, at the great universities of Freiburg, Kiel, Heidelberg and Berlin, he was followed by admiring crowds of students, and always, from his beginning at Leipzig in 1859, to his death in 1895, a period of thirty-six years, his lecture rooms were thronged as those of no other professor in Germany; the concourse attending them reminding one of the great gatherings to hear Abelard in the Middle Ages. They all heard him extol the greatness of Germany, the unexampled dynasty of the Hohenzollerns, the glory of the army.

In person Von Treitschke was a man of high character, of marked intellectual aspect, of great mentality, of utmost sincerity of purpose and of surpassing eloquence. Generations of German students came under his sway and acknowledged his power. He was a friend of Bismarck, the apologist of the Hohenzollerns and the ardent and eager supporter of the bureaucracy of Germany.

In his conviction the State was supreme, and from the State there was no appeal. The individual counted for nothing save as the creature of the State. The State was an army; the army the State. This theory was far older than Von Treitschke, having been that of Frederick Wil-

liam and Frederick the Great in the eighteenth century.

Foremost among the fundamental principles taught by this remarkable man was the stoutly affirmed belief that the Hohenzollerns, by divine right, should rule Prussia, and that Prussia, for the good of Germany, should rule Germany. It was a small step from this proposition to his next main assertion that Germany, for the good of the world, should dominate the world. He came to this conclusion partly through the theory of atheistic evolution, so prevalent in German thought, and partly on account of his exalted idealisation of the German character and culture. He believed that in "the struggle for life," followed by "the survival of the fittest," Germany had won in the struggle, and Germany of all was the fittest. This led him to regard with ill-concealed contempt all other nations and led him to the belief that it would be for their welfare if Germany dominated over them.

He particularly hated and despised Great Britain. Throughout his whole career he regarded it with scorn, antipathy and hatred, and he poured out contempt, rancor and insult continually upon the English character and upon the English nation. He called them the "robber among the nations," affirming that they held their

undeserved sway over about a fifth of the world on account of their insular position, the supineness of the other nations, the duplicity of their diplomacy and the hypocrisy of the English character. His denunciation of the English people and government was a sort that, applied to an individual, it would be insulting to the last degree, and he evermore looked forward and worked toward the day when Germany, assailing England, should beat her down in war and become the master of the world.

If we have raised a question as to the amazing conceit of Germany as expressed in many a pompous phrase since the beginning of this war, let it be said that this is a proper consequence and expression of the philosophy of Treitschke and his associates, the great school that grew up around him, followed his leadership, and developed his ideals.

Germany was to dominate the world for the good of the world, and for the domination of the world by Germany, the army was the great instrument. This army was to be conterminous with the State, and the State with the army; the entire State a military power, and war the method of its supremacy. Nowhere in the seventeen volumes of Von Treitschke's collected works, not in his great history, which is regarded

with the utmost respect in Germany, did he ever say a word against war, never calling it the scourge of mankind or deprecating its existence, but, like his influential disciple, Bernhardi, if not in the same words, he regarded war as a biological necessity, indicating the virility of the nation and leading to the highest good of mankind. Any attempt to abolish war was unwise and immoral.

In order that this theory of conquest might be carried out by an invincible army it was necessary to regard as brothers only those dwelling within the German State. Outside of those boundaries there was no fraternal obligation. The theory of the way the war was to be carried on demanded that it be ruthless to the last degree. I am not now averring that Von Treitschke himself elaborated every detail of the system now being carried out; but he originated it, inspired it and was followed by a great multitude of intellectuals who gave their assent to his leadership and more fully worked out his theory.

Inhumanity in war, as the world understands inhumanity, is one of the fundamental conditions of war, as this school of philosophy holds it. It stopped at nothing. It knew no mercy, hesitated at no atrocity, deliberately proposed to massacre, murder, deport, torture, starve to

death those who stood in its way. Such is the theory and such the practise.

Quite as visibly as this philosophy repudiates humanity it despises morals; particularly those morals which relate to truth. Astonished, we have heard the statement of the German Chancellor that treaties were only scraps of paper. But it is a definite part of their theory that there are no moralities which should stand between the nation and the development of its ideals.

Having repudiated morality and humanity, the question arose: how should this attitude of leading minds be made that of the entire German nation, of whom great multitudes were both moral and humane? Modern morality and humanity, as we understand them, are distinctly Christian in their spirit and purpose. To fulfill, therefore, the purpose of Germany to dominate the world by an army engaged in ruthless war, unrestrained by morality and humanity, it became necessary to dispossess the German people of the Christian ideals of morals and humaneness which had possessed them. Therefore, this political philosophy deliberately gave itself to the most violent attack upon Christianity. Until they could rid the German people of the ideals of Christianity, their philosophy could not penetrate or control the nation.

The attack upon Christianity was deliberately made, toward a hundred years ago. When, about the middle of the last century, Strauss assailed the Gospel and the life of Christ as mythical, he was following out the lines of this policy, and at that time not a few were led away by his theories. But later the development became much more widespread, intense and more sweepingly antagonistic.

Many of the German political philosophers affirm that the greatest mistake which Germany has ever made was in accepting Christianity from the Roman Empire in the fifth century. They declare that the Roman Empire was then effete and in a decline; that Galilee, from which the Roman Empire took the Christian faith, was also a decadent nation, and that it has always been a dreary spell cast upon the mind of Germany, that they accepted this religion. For thirty generations, some of them declare, Germany has struggled to rid itself of an alien religion; of a vision which it did not respect; of a God that it would not adore; of a system of religion which was foreign to the German genius. Germany's native instinct for playing a creative role in religion had been stunted and thwarted. Germany, they declare, should exercise creative powers in the matter of religion, repudiating all but its own

creation. That religion they called "The Religion of Valor." One of its mottoes is to "Live dangerously."

Von Treitschke's thought of the State was the State controlled by nothing but its own ideals. Those who followed him reaffirmed this with additional energy. Napoleon was their ideal rather than Christ; Corsica rather than Galilee, became to them the seat of the ideas which they would espouse. They travestied and do now the Beatitudes. Instead of saying "Blessed are the peace makers" they say "Blessed are the war makers, for they shall conquer the earth and shall receive the applause, if not of Jehovah, of Odin, who is greater than Jehovah." They repudiated the beatitude on the meek, and blessed the valiant rather than the teachable; and instead of commending the poor in spirit, they commended the exalted and heroic in spirit who have no sense of humanity. They prepared to found a world empire and also a world religion.

This "Religion of Valor" had in it no place for Christian virtues and was to be substituted for the Christian faith. Sympathy, kindness, humanity were labelled weaknesses.

But now, as the Christian religion, especially in the mind of the German people, was dependent upon the Bible, which Luther had so greatly ex-

alted in the sixteenth century, it became necessary to the scheme of German philosophy and German conquest, to break up the foundations of Christianity by weakening the authority of the Bible. They, therefore, set about this systematically, and during recent years have been urgent to propagate what is called popularly "The Destructive Criticism." The whole strength of German scholarship, with few exceptions, has been turned to the effort to destroy the authority of the Bible as related to Christianity, to morals and to humanity. So doing, they still retained their self-created religion and morals, which they called "The Religion of Valor."

The evil influence of their destructive work passed to other nations, and many who called themselves scholars surrendered to the assumptions of German so-called scholarship. When, therefore, they came to the moment of war upon the whole world, their theory, link by link, could be stated thus: The Hohenzollerns, for the good of Prussia, should dominate Prussia; Prussia, for the good of Germany, should dominate Germany; Germany, for the good of the world, should dominate the world. Germany should dominate the world because it was superior and the nations of the world contemptible.

The agency of German domination should be the army. The army should perform its work with a ruthless disregard of all the so-called laws of war, of morality and of humanity. To sweep away the reverence of the German people for morality and humanity it was necessary to get rid of the Christian religion, which was the foundation of these virtues, and to substitute therefor, as they did, another, which was anti-Christian, called "The Religion of Valor," as pagan as Attila's.

To make sure that they could rid themselves and the German people of the Christian religion, they deemed it necessary that they should destroy the authority of the Holy Scriptures. This they did, among themselves, and considerably among the nations of the world. But while they had a religion left, which, though pagan, was powerful, those of other lands who accepted their anti-Christian and anti-Biblical theories, had nothing left except the sentiment of religion, and found themselves in this country, and to a considerable extent also in Britain, without an authoritative and divine religion and corresponding conviction; but holding an emasculated, non-authoritative sentiment, many among us even questioning whether it was consistent with Christianity to fight for faith, for humanity and for

morality. So the German philosophy worked to its own strengthening, for its own purpose, and to the weakening of all those nations on whom they proposed to fall. The Germans became ruthless warriors. Many so-called Christians became sentimental pacifists.

You have wondered why the German Emperor is making so many appeals to God and nevertheless seems to lack Christian moral sense and Christian humanity. I have given you the reason. The God of Germany is not the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, is not the God of the Christian Scriptures, but the manufactured patron of German conquest and world dominion.

Many will now inquire, "How could a theory like this, being taught, dispossess a nation of the fundamental principles of Christianity?" My answer is easy. Most singular illusions sweep over and possess myriads of mankind. For example, in the United States of America we have the delusion known as Mormonism. It is alleged by its devotees that in 1827 one Joseph Smith discovered plates of gold on which, in "reformed Egyptian"—whatever that may be—were the statements which he afterward made to the world. It matters not that Joseph Smith was a person of low and vile character, notorious for

falsehood, for idleness, for immorality. It matters not to those who follow him that the stories which he told of the possession of these plates are totally unbelievable and contradictory. There are now hundreds of thousands of followers of this man in America, whom they revere as a prophet and a saint.

He said, for example, that these golden plates were given him in a supernatural way; but no such golden plates have ever been seen or known. He declared first that they were given him by a man of Spanish aspect, whose throat was cut and blood running down. He afterward declared that they were given to him by an angel. He affirmed that whoever looked upon these plates would die. He afterward promised that he would show them, which he never did, to a very large circle of friends. The theology which they developed was fantastic; the history fictitious; the morality outrageous; and yet, from that time to this, there have been gathering more and more people to the standard of Mormonism, following Joseph Smith and Brigham Young, until today they hold the balance of political power in several States of the American Union. They are a financial force which is recognised among the powerful forces of the nation and is looked upon with awe and fear. They declare their

purpose to rule the nation. They send forth more missionaries, in proportion to their numbers, than any other body which calls itself religious. They obtained their statehood by perjury to the national government, declaring that they had abandoned polygamy, which they never abandoned and which their head declared afterward before a committee of Congress, he still practised; and so, in unnumbered ways, they have given the lie to their pretensions and shown the utter folly of those who accept their theories.

If all that could be done in America within less than one hundred years by an ignorant, dishonorable, superstitious and degraded leader, what may you not expect when you see the forces which operated in Germany to supplant Christianity, humanity and morality, and to send the nation forth on a plan of world conquest? Behind the German purpose were nearly two hundred years of very great material prosperity under their form of government. Their rulers, a powerful family deserving well in many respects of their people, their theory of superiority and dominion highly satisfactory to the self-consciousness, the pride and the ambitions of the German people; their teachers, the foremost philosophers of their time, the chief theologians, the leading scientific and literary men. And bear

in mind that all these German teaching forces were the creatures of the State; they were selected by the State; they received their salaries from the State, from the foremost to the least in the lowest schools. They were discharged if they failed to please the State; and so they flung the sum total of the forces of a powerful government and an immense force of highly trained teachers into the work of justifying and leading this great empire on a course and career of world conquest. Such an appeal so fathered, fostered and taught, is adequate and ample to produce the results we now behold.

It is plain enough that this is a rational accounting for the results of their theory upon the German nation, creating a solidarity as remarkable as that of any nation in human history.

This purpose is "inspired by the pulpits as religion; taught by the universities as philosophy; disseminated by the press as policy and political necessity; embodied in the army as national loyalty and duty, and focused on the Kaiser as the minister of the Almighty." Blasphemous, fundamentally narrow and inhuman as it is, you can see how it became an obsession, a very devil of pride in the breasts of seventy million Germans.

And here let me present additional proofs of

the truth that this is the base and beginning, as well as the strength of this war on the German side, by calling your attention to certain collateral historical evidence. All that I have presented is absolutely consistent with everything that the German powers have done in the three years since the beginning of this war. Do we declare that they have violated all principles of Christianity, of humanity or morality? The evidence is before the whole world, written on the bloodiest pages of human history. Let me dwell upon it briefly to show how really this is true.

III

If the so-called morals of Germany during this war, and disclosed by it, are in harmony with the theory which I have stated, then we have a strong proof that this theory is working out. That this is true, let me prove from two or three considerations.

First, when the United States of America sent away the Ambassador of Germany and severed diplomatic relations, when we finally declared that a state of war existed between Germany and the United States, our government acted chiefly on moral ground, as the state papers of the United States allege. If you turn to the docu-

mentary history of the breach of relations between us and Germany you find our government asserting that this was made necessary by three considerations: First, because Germany had violated the law of truth in breaking promises made to us, destroying our citizens on the high seas without warning; levying war against us while pretending peace; endeavouring to stir up our nearest neighbor against us to invasion and to assault while assuming to be our friend.

The second affirmation of our government was that Germany had violated its pledges to the whole world of civilised nations in the matter of international law. This we supported and substantiated by citing the case of Belgium and northern France, as well as by other affirmations; and this again was a violation by the German Empire of the law of truth, in the realm of morals.

The third charge that our government brought against Germany was the violation of the laws of nations and humanity, superseding the same by cruelty and inhumanity, as in the deportation of the Belgian and French people, and numerous other acts of savagery and cruelty.

All these acts and allegations, as you perceive, are in the realm of moral laws and duties, such as are revered and held by all civilised nations.

The course of the Allies was identical with that of our own government and their grounds of war practically the same. For when some months ago, Germany assumed to make offers of peace, in which no one had any confidence, the answer of the Allies was mainly to the effect that Germany had violated truth and pledges to such an extent that it could not be trusted. Moral laws, as to treaties and pledges made by the Germans, had been set at naught, to prove which the Allies quoted Germany's own statements, confessions and actions.

Second, the Allies declared they could not make peace because of the violations of plighted faith to the nations, which Germany had voluntarily taken and which, regardless of truth, she had steadily and most outrageously violated.

And third, the humanities, they alleged, had all been violated by Germany, although internationally accepted and sanctioned by them with others.

This common attitude of the United States and of the Allies was met by Germany with a practical admission of the truth of all they stated. Germany avows, and has avowed, that it will do whatever it judges to be necessary to attain its ends, irrespective of any promises or engagements made at any time. It has also alleged that

pledges, promises and humanities are not binding upon it; and also that nothing shall be allowed to stand in the way of its national aspirations and evolution as it interprets the same. That is to say, Germany practically admits the charges of the United States and the Allies, that it has repudiated all morals and all humanity as universally held and understood.

You can but perceive that we have before us here two theories of morals and of life. The German theory is a theory of morals made by the German nation, operative within its own borders, and operative on other nations only in so far as it can enforce its will on them. Now, if one nation has a right to make its own code of morals, another and every other nation has the same right. If every nation makes its own code of morals, moral relations cannot be international. There can be no system of universal interchange on a moral basis of numerous nations holding different and presumably divergent theories of morals. All world relations, therefore, must cease unless they are merely relations of hostility.

On the other hand, America and the Allies present a theory of morals universal in its character, and of universal benevolence, founded not on legislation or statute of the State and subject to no State revisal or amendment, but given by

the Ruler of the universe for the promotion of appropriate human relations between all the peoples of the earth. It is manifest that these two systems are not only mutually exclusive but mutually antagonistic, and that the two can never subsist except in a state of conflict. Which, then, shall be overpowered and which shall remain as the rule of human life among the nations of mankind?

Like morality, humanity is really a question of moral duties, infilled with human brotherhood and affection. In the repudiation of humanity Germany has simply taken a step contrary to the conviction, thought and feeling of all the other nations of the world and in violation of their highest moral sense. There is no language strong enough to express the antagonism of the civilised world against Germany for what it has done in Belgium, France, Armenia and Syria—in Poland, Serbia and Russia. Is there any law of humanity, is there any sense of right among mankind, is there any sentiment of civilisation which Germany has not absolutely repudiated in her dealings with those who have been subjugated by her military power?

Armenia has suffered the greatest persecution of Christian martyrs ever known since Christian history began. Massacre, torture, deportation,

ravishment, starvation have carried off a million and a half of the people of Armenia within the last two and one-half years. All missionaries, even missionaries of German churches, have asserted that Germany was responsible; that it could have prevented the horrors wrought by Turk and Kurd; that German authorities have countenanced and have assisted in this horrible work. You have only to read the statements of Von Bissing, late Governor of Belgium, and other of the leading German authorities to understand that deliberately they planned and proposed to reduce these lands to a desert and to repopulate them with German people and with the captives whom they might enslave in war.

It is the German who advised the Moslem to originate a "holy war," (called the "Jehad"), by which they expected two hundred and fifty million Mohammedans would rise up and fall upon the Christian peoples of the world and destroy them, as Mohammed and the Saracens sought to do in the first centuries of the Moslem propaganda. That such a "holy war," so-called, did not eventuate was because the Moslems, more humane than the German, resented and repudiated the demand of the German power and their servile adherents, the Turks.

The story of the submarines is a story of cruel-

ties which no pirates in history have ever duplicated. While the modes of war on the field of battle, the destructive agencies employed, the effort not merely to annihilate, but to torture and to cause the most frightful suffering, the wanton destruction and desolation of all that civilisation cherishes—these all have been a portion of the German policy, deliberately planned, threatened, prepared, done and justified for years.

The authorities are so many, the voice of all nations consenting to this indictment is so unanimous, the investigations so fully prove all that I have said, that I think I need add nothing to the statement that the course of Germany since the beginning of the war is entirely in harmony with its political philosophy, and indicates exactly what we are fighting and what for.

IV

And now finally: What is the battle upon which we have entered? What the goal of the struggle, the stake of the war, in which we are engaged? We have portrayed the foe, measured by his purposes, designs and practises. Through long years, while we have been inattentive, supine, indifferent, Germany has been penetrated

and permeated with the idea of world dominion by world war. In 1912 more than seven hundred books on war were published in Germany, and all that they have done in the last three years had been forecast and really foretold by them with the utmost audacity.

Our battle is more than a war for national defence, great as that is; more than a war of American patriotism, the care of our own people on sea and land; more than a war for the integrity and rehabilitation of Belgium and France, and the support of our Allies fighting for the world's right; more than co-operation with a score of nations who withstand Germany. Our war is a war for the race in its highest ideals and its greatest hopes. When Charles Martel turned back the Saracen in southern France in the early centuries he did no less than is obligatory upon the nations of the world to-day in fighting back the German invasion. Against their overweening pride and vanity, their falseness, traitorousness, intolerable inhumanity, cruelty, tyranny, spoliation and subjugation we are fighting. Are not these causes adequate? Is there not motive enough in these to awaken the hundred millions of America to withstand with the millions of Europeans the terrific forces of German invasion aand destructiveness?

But we are fighting for much more than these. We are fighting for morals, universal, authoritative, beneficent, divine; morals, of men as men, against what is merely local custom, made and applied by a tyrant. Shall we have a moral world? is a question that we are trying to answer in the affirmative.

We are fighting for the maintenance of humanity, fraternal, universal, helpful.

Shall the world be a humane world, or shall massacre, torture, deportation, slaughter, starvation and all kinds of ravages upon men, women and little children be the habit of the world? We are to answer.

We are fighting for the integrity of the race, as brothers, against German masters with the rest of the world slaves. We are fighting for Christianity, the last religious hope of the world, the Christianity which avers the love of God and the love of men as the basis of human life. This they would displace by cruel paganism, a valor which knows no pity, no mercy, no liberty. Surely here is a stake worth the best that we can spend and do.

We take on a heavy burden, for none of us desire war for itself. We do not believe that war is a high state of desirable human life, and so we regard our entrance into this war as a heavy

load, a sad necessity. But no burden which we can assume can be so heavy as having to exist under the domination of immoral and inhuman tyranny.

We know that we shall encounter sufferings which we deprecate and deplore. It is not necessary to describe them; they are too obvious in Europe, as they will be in America. But the worst sufferings and the most that we can encounter in resisting an unregulated and inhuman tyranny cannot compare with the sufferings which Germany victorious inflicts, working its unregulated will. What sufferings we assume are light compared with those which they have already imposed and which they fight to impose upon us.

We must spend vast sums of money. The treasures of centuries must be poured out, and this we would much prefer not to do, but rather to spend our wealth in human help and advancement. Yet this expenditure of billions is a trifle of our wealth compared with the tribute and plunder extorted under the rule of these immoral and inhuman tyrants. Let Belgium, France and Poland tell us how much money Germany would extort from us if she had her will. And so let us learn the wisdom of spending any portion of the whole to protect the vast

remainder. Half of all we have we had best spend in resisting rather than to lose all in submitting; yes, all in resisting rather than any in submitting.

In fighting this fight we must part from friends who go from us perhaps never to return, who give their lives to our defence. We need not dwell on the agony that this inflicts on those who love and revere their own. But parting from our friends, though they never come again, will be infinitely easier than if we should be compelled to stand with them and beside them while they are suffering beyond our aid the tortures which would be inflicted upon them by pagan and inhuman tyrants, as done these three years wherever Germany has had its will. If we must part from friends, let it rather be while we are defending them to our utmost than when standing beside them, we see barbarians wreak their savage will and lust on those whom our manacled hands cannot assist and our shackled limbs cannot help.

We may live, many of us, scarred and deformed by wounds received in battle. But such wounds are few and little compared with those inflicted under the sway of tyrants who know no mercy, and who, as yet, have shown no pity. Better be marred defending

our liberty than scarred by the tortures of our enslavers.

We may die while striving, and many no doubt will as many already have done. But death on the battle line, fighting for freedom and a righteous cause, is a thousand-fold better than living a cowering slave under tyrants who have shown only too clearly how valueless life is when they have its direction and control.

But most of us will live; the vast majority of our nation and the nations will survive. They will survive victorious; they will rejoice over the possession of treasures much richer than all that they cost. And so long as the nations and the generations live they will exult to think that we preserved by heroism to a world which otherwise would be worthless, a beneficent morality, a gracious and tender humanity, and a priceless Christian faith and fraternity, maintained and sanctified by our sacrifices and our valour.

III

The Angels' Song, As They Said It

THE message of the angels to the shepherds of Bethlehem, and to the whole world through them, has been much exploited and little studied, greatly praised and little understood. From the general use of it and comment upon it, one might think it was merely a declaration of Peace versus War. Is there anything more in it than a text for songs, hymns, praises, sermons on peace? We might answer that there is less of this than of several other declarations and implications and that most of its use along the peace line is wholly unwarranted by its form, substance and purpose. Indeed, there are few Scriptures which have been so much used and so misused, so often quoted and misquoted, so freely taught and so slightly studied. It might properly have excited our suspicions long ago that many, not Christians, have assumed to interpret the whole of Christianity which they did not profess, in terms of passive quiet which they scarcely helped to secure; and that we should be told by such that we Christians utterly failed to

make good this first summary of Christianity, ought to have led us to ask at least what it says and what it means. There is very little in the utterance, ("song" if you will), but what has been read into it, and much in it which is never considered. It surely is not primarily a peace message in the sense in which it is commonly used at Christmas and on other occasions. The proof of this is found in the simplest examination and study of this passage of history and Scripture.

First of all, the Bible nowhere calls it a song, an Angels' song, or even says that the angels sang. The first part of the message is delivered to the shepherds by one angel. The second part by "a multitude of the Heavenly host." Of the single angel it is said, "And the angel *said* unto them"; and of the Heavenly multitude it is recorded that they appeared "praising God and *saying*." It may be alleged that an angel's voice is so musical that its sayings would be music and equivalent in tones to song. Possibly. Or that when a multitude of angels spoke a single message in unison they might have sung it. But not necessarily. It is as easy to speak in unison as to sing thus. So let us start to interpret by saying that it is germane to a careful inquiry as to what happened that night to note and record that there is no story of an angel's song or of the

angels' song or any song. This may not seem very important as a correction of an unauthorised interpretation, but we observe that this reading into the message what is not there, is not a matter of this one particular any more than it is of all the details of this truly wonderful message. It is just as true that it is not a message, primarily, of peace any more than it is a message of other great revelations which are far more important to those who first heard it and to us. Let us examine it solely to find out what it said and what it revealed.

With the shepherds keeping watch "over their flocks by night," it is said: "The angel of the Lord came upon them, and the glory of the Lord shone round about them, and they were sore afraid." This angel evidently came from an upper sphere as one settling down from above into the midst of their company. He was "the angel," the messenger "of the Lord." Evidently they so regarded him, and as bearing supernatural character. And "they were sore afraid." The glory of the Lord, the belief that God the Lord was represented by this Angel, made them very much afraid. Why? Why should the presence of God or of a messenger of God cause men to be very much afraid? Here is the secret of the messenger and of the message.

Men, practically all men, who should rejoice in the manifestation and enjoy the presence of God, are afraid of God and the presence of God, just as Adam and Eve were said to have been when sinning. Adam said, "I was afraid." This fear is a revelation of the purpose and occasion of Christ's coming, that He might take it away.

So the very first word of the Angel, and of the Angelic Message, was "*Fear Not.*" "The Angel said unto them, 'Fear Not.'" This is a message through these representatives to the whole race of men. And the wonder is that when people who even reject Christ and the claims of Christ are attempting to tell dogmatically what this early message of Christianity means, they have not seen that its first word is "Fear Not." This is all the more evidence of a lack of keen attention on their part because many say "there is nothing in God to fear." Why then, in their superficial reading, did they not snatch at this angelic exhortation? Perhaps, because the angel then at once told the shepherds the reason why they should dismiss their fears and why the whole world should dismiss its fear of being in the presence of God.

The Angel follows his urgent word of cheer, "Fear Not," by giving them the reason why they

should not fear. What is that reason? He says, "For, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy which shall be to all people." Here is a universal message, first to the shepherds and then to all people, the whole race, all mankind. "Good tidings," "News of great joy," such as to cause a universal joy, the very opposite of fear. And what are these tidings? What is the news which shall remove from men a dread and fear of the presence and the glory of God and his messengers? Hear the answer: "For unto you," says the Angel, "is born this day in the city of David, a Saviour which is Christ the Lord."

We read nothing into this news to make it tell us of a universal blessing to drive away the fears and bring great joy to the whole world, when we say that it plainly declares:

1st. A birth, we call it an "Incarnation," that day taking place in Bethlehem, the city of prophecy.

2nd. "Of a Saviour." This great word by implication affirms that the race needs a Saviour to save it. And when we ask why, the answer must be that the race is an unsaved race, a lost race, a wasted and wandering race. The shepherds could not misunderstand. Neither can anybody who knows human history. If only a Saviour to save from fear, it is a mighty salvation

which takes away the causes of fear, as the only way of removing fears.

3rd. And this Saviour "is Christ the Lord," Christ the Anointed One; the Messiah whom these shepherds and their nation had heard of and longed for through ages of time. And this new born one who is Saviour and Christ and Messiah is "the Lord." This is a word of exaltation and mastery, indicating capacity, superiority and honor.

So far the message is of the first great herald angel. God is made manifest in the flesh, the Saviour, the Deliverer, the Chosen Christ of God, the Lord and Master. Such is the actual message of the individual angel's "Song," which is not a song.

Then, that no mark of assurance may be lacking from the messenger angel and to these representatives of the common human race, he tells them in detail how and where they shall find this great One, born this day, born to be a Saviour. In these words the individual angel has given the main part of the heaven-sent disclosure.

"And suddenly there appeared with the Angel a multitude of the Heavenly Host praising God and saying—" Evidently they were enforcing his glad tidings. All being from God, all accredited messengers, all being of the Heavenly Hosts,

they appeared to add assurance and to cheer with gladness the shepherds who represented all people, that is, all mankind. It is not said that they sang. It is immaterial whether they did or did not. But what did they *say*, as they praised God?

May we pause to note that praise—the uplift of heart and voice to God—was their attitude and act? Let those who prate of "Peace on Earth," etc., bear in mind that *praise* to God for the Saviour incarnate is the *first* thing in the angelic heart after knowing that truth. This is the only cause of praise mentioned here.

And what did the angels say? For what they said is of much consequence. A misquotation of it is the stock of those who discourse of the "Angels' song of Peace."

First of all, they said, "Glory to God in the highest." Here is a chance for intelligent explanation, and for explanation not likely to be of doubtful meaning. This is an ascription on their part of the highest, most exalted place and supremacy to God. In the highest place, holding the highest rank, supreme over all, they declare God to be. Among the mighty and glorious He is mightiest and most glorious. Their word is as declarative as that of the first angel, and as important. God is most glorious of beings and to

be more and especially glorified because of the Saviour born, sent, and saving. Let those who crave *peace* remember that the hope of it comes when God is recognised, enthroned, obeyed, praised and glorified by man, and not until then. Exalt God to His highest throne, greatest among the great and recognise His glory in giving a Saviour, as beyond all other reasons the supreme cause of adoration of Him. So they command.

On sweeps the angelic exhortation "to all people." "And on earth" (as He is glorified among all the powers of heaven and earth here represented) "Peace." The form of speech here is made into English with a very slight variation, in several ways.

"Peace among men in whom He (God) is well pleased." "Peace among men of good pleasure." "Peace, good pleasure among men."

Evidently *peace* is the prominent idea at this point to and among men. Is it particular men? Men of a certain character, quality, relationship to God? Evidently and surely. Say it is "among men in whom He is well pleased." Their peace is conditional on the fact that God is pleased with them. What kind of men are they in whom God has pleasure? Who pleases Him so that He favours them? Men of good pleasure? Men who find their pleasure in Goodness, men whose will is

good, who agree with God and who by righteousness will go among men and so make social peace.

Is there in this whole message any statement, announcement, declaration to suggest that "Peace," as that term has been used in regard to the "Angels' Song," is ever coming to men who refuse the Saviour, who reject the Messiah, who do not recognise the supremacy of God, who do not submit to Him and glorify His supremacy? Is there a sign or suggestion that Christ came into the world to make peace among the nations of men who are willingly Godless; wilfully sinful; whose wills are not to please God or to scatter among men the fruits of a generous and holy life? I see no such crude and irrational meaning. Yet that is the commonly alleged meaning, wholly unwarranted as it is unannounced.

Peace in this world in the individual, the small neighbourhood, and the larger associated bodies of men, is a product of Divine provision accepted, and human character adjusted to that provision, so pleasing God and rendering righteousness, peace and joy possible among men. It comes and is made through faith in God, in the Incarnation, in Jesus Christ the Lord.

When men accept the Angels' announcement, take hold on the grace of God, receive, seek, wor-

ship Christ, grasp His universal redemption; exalt His Holy Name; glorify Him, gain His good will by love and obedience, and the good will of men by love and service, then they find peace in finding its sources, conditions and causes. *And not till then.*

Peace to men who will the will of God is a great result of an adequate cause, and it comes to those who receive Christ as here disclosed, who exalt and obey God as He is here revealed.

IV

The Doctrine of Jesus About Resistance to Evil

NUMBERS of believers in Christ declare their conviction that He taught the doctrine of non-resistance and that those who follow and obey Him cannot, under any circumstances, fight even in self-defence. To establish their position they quote principally the passage at the end of Matthew V. 38-42, the word most often cited being: "But whosoever smiteth thee on the right cheek turn him the other also." The eminent Russian, Tolstoi, seems to have founded his theory of Christian non-resistance and opposition to war mostly on this passage.

Many who cannot quite make up their minds that it is duty to passively endure and never to resist the evil aggressions of all assailants do, nevertheless, take up arms against wicked and malicious foes while avowing their theoretical faith in the opposite policy. These seem to think that Christ's teaching is not really practical. So they cut loose from it under stress, resolved later

to return to their allegiance after practising contrary to it for a season. This course seems to us very reprehensible. If one believes in Christ he cannot lay off for a time and then resume and take on the obligations of Christian allegiance. This would be, on his part, irrational as well as treasonable. If Christ's teaching is not for life as life, if it is "a thing of shreds and patches," then it is not worthy to command human faith or respect.

The wonder is that our Lord has been so misinterpreted that men quote Him as against all defensive strife, both in precept or example. Let us examine fairly His words and seek His evident meaning. And first this passage in Matthew:

It is fair to premise that this language is not wholly literal as is the most rigid statement of a fact; that it is, in part, at least, figurative or picturesque. This premise asks no concession except the use of plain common sense. Language is not degraded, not distorted or rendered obscure when used figuratively. It is rather elevated and dignified. Very much of our language, common and literary, is not in the use of the first and primary meaning of the words but in a picture meaning. Thousands of examples of this are near at hand and daily on our lips.

That we may get Matthew V. 38-42 in its plain sense, we have to take up the whole passage of which it is a part. In verse 29, in the part relating to adultery, it is said, "If thy right eye cause thee to stumble pluck it out and cast it from thee, etc." A similar suggestion or direction follows immediately about "thy right hand" ("cut it off, etc."). No one can for a moment suppose that this is a literal direction; that in a treatment of lustful passion, the right eye is to be plucked out and cast away; and so of the hand. Both are plainly figurative expressions of the doctrine of self-denial and self-control. Literally construed they are absurd; figuratively used they are intense and impressive instructions. I think also that the next passage, about oaths, must be assumed to contain figurative commandment as well as literal. Whether legal and judicial oaths are forbidden, I will not argue, though I believe not. But let this be one way or the other; verse 37 says, "But let your yea be yea and your nay nay, for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil." Unexplained, to the literalist, this means that anything spoken more or besides "yea, yea—nay, nay, cometh of evil." This is absurd.

There is a world of conversation which is neither "yea" nor "nay," which does not "come of

evil." When I deny or affirm it is not of evil that I say more than nay and yea. However, the meaning is not at all obscure. A simple affirmative or negative is the proper mode of assent or denial rather than expletives and oaths. And a disposition to multiply asseverations arises from evil rather than good. They are unnecessary to a truthful man and superfluous, and the harm of such oaths is obvious to honest thought. Here then is a second instance of figurative language in this paragraph of Christ's present teaching.

And now we read in verse 28, "Ye have heard that it was said an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, etc." It was also said "hand for hand, foot for foot, burning for burning, wound for wound, stripe for stripe" (Exodus 21. 24-25). Did Christ intend to state what He stated as being all that He recognised and allowed of the old law? Were the other two thirds of this original direction to be left unrepealed by Him and was He to repeal these two particulars alone? Evidently not so. The meaning originally in Exodus was to thus state the principle of equity and responsibility in graphic terms. Because nothing is said about ears or noses or toes or legs or arms. Evidently literalness would destroy the whole purport of the ordinance and

confine it to a few bodily members and instances. No rational mind can think this.

So, then, presumably what our Lord is about to utter for which this reference paves the way, is something which shall supersede a crude rule of equivalents and reveal the spirit of equity and social justice. He continues, "But I say unto you that ye resist not evil—but whosoever smiteth thee on the right cheek turn to him the other also." Does Christ here teach that we must not resist evil? What then are we to do when we resist not evil? Do we passively agree to it, whatever its form? No. "Evil" is a word of breadth which includes injurious and hurtful agents and agencies whether physical or moral. Cold is an evil to a delicate body, so is sickness of any sort; so fire breaking out or flood; or an incursion of destructive insects or animals. Whatever works visible harm, injury and suffering is evil, as vice, revenge, ignorance, prejudice. Certainly He would never teach us to offer no resistance, opposition or correction to any form of evil. Then surely we must explain His word as not literal but figurative, giving, in picture, a statement of a principle of right conduct. So it must be explained. So of intellectual, social, moral and spiritual evil. Thus instructed, we resume:

"But whosoever shall smite thee on the right cheek turn to him the other also." Here is one kind of evil, if literal, a very narrow form. What is it, if merely literal, as we are asked to take it? Why, this—that if any man smite thee (you) on the right cheek you turn to him the other (the left cheek) also. Just this and no more, if literal. But suppose I am struck on my left cheek, what shall I do? Or on my eye, or nose or chin or anywhere else on my body? Then the literalist must say, "I have no word of direction from Christ, what course I shall take." This is being literal but ridiculous. The Great Teacher's utterances are belittled immeasurably by such silly interpretations. It is foolish and absurd. Because literalness reduces it to absurdity, our reverence for Christ leads us, as in the four preceding instances (in v. 29, 30, 37, 38), to inquire as to its real meaning. At once it becomes plain. The slap on the right or left cheek is the insult offered by an angry man who wishes to show disesteem and provoke a quarrel. In days of knighthood such a flick of hand or glove was an indignity which called for a challenge and mortal combat. Our Lord virtually says: Receive such indignity not as one who has no further resources of patience, but as one who could stand even more and yet keep his fullest

self-control. Better so, to show the calmness of your spirit and your self-mastery, than to engage in useless and passionate fighting over a slight provocation. This makes sense of the passage and honors the Teacher. The literal interpretation is nonsense and useless.

Proceeding to the next direction the same principle of interpretation gives the only sensible meaning to the text: "If any man will go to law with thee ("sue thee at the law") and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also." Shall we be told that this forbids all legal defence and demands surrender of legal rights to property rather than contest and defence? Not so. Stated literally what does it say? (Compare Matthew and Luke.) "If any man will sue thee at the law and take away thy undershirt, let him have thine overshirt also" (the order of garments being reversed in Luke). Is this done ever anywhere? No. But explain it and wisdom at once appears. Here is a litigious contestant over a mere trifle who wills to sue you. There are such: Courts and society abound in them. Then and now, Courts of law are not certainly Courts of Justice. The whole matter in controversy is trifling. Better yield a trifle than to enter upon uncertain, tedious and endless litigation. We have known wise men in business, who in large

matters never went to law, because of its injustices and uncertainties. They were carrying out the wisdom of Christ's teachings. The absolute literal sense is evidently useless for our times or any time. The true sense is full of practical wisdom.

The next direction is likewise valuable but useless if literally interpreted. "If any man compel thee to go with him a mile, go with him twain." Nothing of this sort ever occurs in our modern life. So then, if literal, it would now be meaningless to us. But at that time, perhaps now in distant lands, as you worked in your little field, some nabob with his train might come past and demand that you go a mile with them. To refuse, though it were resisting petty tyranny, would be disastrous, might cost you great loss. On the other hand your affairs would not suffer if you quietly and kindly went, if you also should say, "I will freely go another mile for your convenience," it might be the best kind of policy; placating rather than exasperating. A good principle under such circumstances then and there, now and everywhere.

Following: "Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away," is easily explicable and valuable in the light of the preceding principles of interpre-

tation. It is not a command to give to anyone and everyone anything and everything he asks, as when your child asks for poison or a razor or a gun—it commands and directs a generous and helpful spirit. And when one wants to borrow, which implies a purpose to return the thing borrowed, he being now in necessity, do not disregard his need by turning away, unfeeling and unheeding, but consider his case as it deserves and help him if he deserves it.

And now completing the passage of Christ's teaching, as if to demonstrate the common sense and truth of this interpretation of divine wisdom, we have the final word. He notes, "It has been said, love your neighbor and hate your enemy." Here Jesus says, "Love your enemies and pray for them that persecute you." Is this literal or figurative? Plainly literal. It could not rise to a nobler sense or command a higher duty than what it plainly teaches. It is plain, practical, right, noble and Godlike. Therefore it needs no explanation, only obedience. But love to an enemy does not permit him to work injury on himself, on you, or on another, if you can prevent it. There is no expression of love in letting a criminal work his will. It is every way loving to stop him. It shows good will to him and everybody involved.

Thus reading and interpreting these messages in the teachings of Christ, in their own light and in harmony with the light of reason and all revelation, we find nothing whatever to sustain the pacifist's contention that Christ here taught the doctrine of non-resistance and pacifism, as is often alleged.

Again it has been said that Christ declared, "I came not to send peace but a sword," and that this proves that he intended to generate and direct war.

This passage (Matthew X. 34) is so interpreted but not reasonably. "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth. I came not to send peace but a sword. For I came to set a man at variance against his father and the daughter against her mother. . . . And a man's foes shall be those of his own household."

No one supposes that Christ came into this world to generate hostility between members of a family. Not as a desirable end do these enmities come from His teaching; nor can the sword be used literally here as a weapon and symbol of war. Variance in families does not take the form of pitched battles with weapons of war. Is it not plain that Christ here declares that His doctrine, so pacifying and loving, the greatest guide for family and social harmony, will be so

resisted by the wicked that they will fiercely and cruelly oppose it when embraced by their intimates and kindred? Not that such is the purpose of God but inseparable from the evil hearts of men. He does not seek nor willingly generate war, but aggressive goodness brings it on through the evil minds of those who refuse the goodness, and He rather teaches not non-resistance but to withstand them and persist in obedience to Him.

It would seem on first reading that the words of Jesus in answer to Pilate—John 18. 36—are against ever fighting. "My Kingdom is not of this world; if my Kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight that I should not be delivered to the Jews; but now is my Kingdom not from hence." The inference hastily drawn is that because we are the citizens of the Kingdom of which Christ is King, therefore we will not fight. But this inference is much too broad to be reasonable. This error in interpretation is drawn from several misunderstandings:

1. Though Christ's Kingdom is not of this world, each of us is, *as He was not,* a part of a Kingdom in this world, to which we owe numerous duties. Therefore what was most incumbent upon Him may not be so upon us, e. g., to vote, to hold office, to act as jurors.

2. We assume that we are to do exactly what Christ did in this world. This is an inference from undue humanising of Christ in our estimate of Him, as if He were imitable in all respects. The truth is, that He is in a class by Himself. We can have likeness but never exact identity of action. Nor do we wish to do so. In numerous respects He did not do what we do and did what we are under no obligation to do. For example, He entered upon His public work at thirty years of age. This is not a rule or a duty for us. He was then baptized in the Jordan. We cannot be and need not be. He never married. Our duty does not lie in celibacy. Of numerous occupations of our time in which we engage, he followed none. He was not an artist, or an engineer, or a merchant, etc. He died on a cross. We do not, need not. All these are inimitable doings of our Lord.

Besides, latterly and erroneously, His words "My Kingdom," "The Kingdom of Heaven," "of God," are asserted to mean only and always a social state and relation in this world. This is an excess of some modern sociologists; it is not New Testament teaching. The Lord's Prayer teaches us concerning the Kingdom of the Holy God in heaven which we pray may "come on earth as it is in heaven"; and also of an inward

subjective psychological condition which corresponding to the objective Kingdom is described as the Kingdom of God which is not meat and drink but "Righteousness (in the Holy Spirit), Peace (in the Holy Spirit) and Joy in the Holy Spirit." When Jesus said, "My Kingdom is not of this world," in which sense did he use "Kingdom"? And who can deny that pursuant to His purposes, his ends were to be attained by being delivered to the Jews and not by fighting carnally with the ecclesiastical Jewish powers on the part of his servants; or against the Roman powers by "twelve legions of angels"?

The particular circumstances which Christ here outlines seem to us as very far away from either a command or an example that His servants should be non-resistant in kingdoms which are in this world and must be practically governed.

Yet another word spoken (Luke 22. 38) as a command by Him to His apostles needs to be listened to that we may better understand our duty. Their equipment was to be a purse, a wallet, "and he that hath none let him sell his garment and buy a sword." This would seem to be an explicit direction worth examining. "And they said, Lord, behold here are two swords. And He said unto them, It is enough." Doubtless this means that two swords were

enough, as part of their equipment—two swords for eleven men. Have not this command and comment a clear meaning, and do they not cast light on our inquiry?

Why did He direct to procure any sword? Why was a sword so necessary that one should sell his garment, perchance a cloak, and with the proceeds buy a sword? And why were two swords among eleven men enough?

The answer would seem to be that the actual sword was a means of defence, not for enforcing the gospel but for protecting the apostles, as did the wallet and purse. The fewness of the swords indicates the improbability of their being used for aggression. Perchance the swords possessed, and kept sheathed, indicated at once their owners' right and ability to use them; but more, their self-control, patience and purpose to set up a government by teaching rather than by force. For the spread of the gospel at the point of the sword is not conducive to its appropriate reception and influence on men. The order, the necessity, the adequacy of two swords for eleven men means something. It certainly does not mean passive non-resistance, however explained.

Thus examining fairly all that our Lord said which is ever quoted as relating to fighting, it seems to us that it cannot be truly alleged to

directly deal with the subject of war at all. These texts are part of the general teachings of Jesus on spirit and duty. They answer no good purpose whatever if distorted into cowardice, pacifism, non-resistance and acquiescence in the aggressions of wicked men in human society. For Jesus Christ teaches that God governs the world with law, righteousness and justice; with discipline, reward and penalty, and that He lays upon men the duty of maintaining, teaching and executing these essentials of His world order.

Through men, He teaches, by men, He warns, with men as His agents, He disciplines, chastens and corrects. If good men should allow evil men to practise wickedness unpunished, this course would neither imitate God nor harmonise with His administration. If wickedness assails, righteousness defends and God takes the side of righteousness.

Had Christ taught non-resistance to evil, He would have overthrown rather than established the Kingdom of God.

V

The Perils of a Premature Peace

IN our civic allegiance at this time, and in every time and place, we are before everything else Americans and patriots, and the bond of our Americanism and patriotism is being strengthened by our common perils, of which we are beginning to be aware.

During the easy-going years of the near past, theorists have arisen, affirming that it is unmanly and unwise to be afraid, and we have been told how useless are the occasions, how hurtful are the consequences of fear. But he who does not know enough to fear when there is real danger, to be defensively aware of it, to take heed and guard against it, is not wise for this life or for the next. So at this time when I try to awaken in your minds a sense of the perilous conditions which menace us and of the disasters that may follow our failure to take warning, it is not to weaken us through fear but to strengthen us through prudence; for while we might recklessly pass on where danger is impending, it is the part of

839599

prudent and courageous souls to keep watch and guard.

On this occasion, I seek to convince you generally, of "The Perils of a Premature Peace," in the midst of a colossal war; specifically, of the numerous perils which are concentrated in that one greatest peril of the times. We are challenged and threatened by the German purpose to subjugate and dominate the world. The Central powers, under Prussian and German leadership, long ago openly resolved to conquer, to enslave, and to despoil the world; to bring it by conquest under their absolute control, to reduce under their will all men, nations and races; and to seize of what we have, whatever they choose, without our consent. So saying (and without fear of contradiction, for I am quoting their statements openly made), I would reveal the purpose and spirit of that mighty and threatening force, which to secure this supremacy, has for three years and more convulsed the world with an unprecedented assault upon all human rights.

The present ruler of Germany in the year 1892, at a conference at the Palace at Potsdam, with five hundred chosen men of that great realm, distributed to them a pamphlet beginning with these words: "The Pan-German Empire: From

Hamburg on the North Sea to the Persian Gulf. Our immediate goal, 250,000,000 of people. Our ultimate goal, the Germanisation of all the world." This must be by force and conquest. It is not to be supposed that these millions desire or consent to be subjugated and enslaved by Germany's ambition and power. It is only possible through war and invasion. So this design of bloody war to subvert the world is not even veiled. It is distinctly avowed. What he says of his heroes fully proves this to be his method. This is what is meant by "Pan-Germanism," a favourite term with them. It does not mean that they were there in the interest of all Germany, but in the interest of making all the world German—of Germanising the whole world. He further said: "From childhood, I have been under the influence of five men: Alexander the Great, Julius Cæsar, Theodoric the Second, Frederick the Great, and Napoleon Bonaparte. Each of these men dreamed a dream of world empire. They failed. I am dreaming a dream of the German world-empire, and my mailed fist shall succeed."

Then and there in Potsdam, he launched the enterprise with the consent and approbation of that co-operating assembly, and this but a short time after he became Kaiser.

The Crown Prince of Germany, the successor, as he assumes, by Divine right, of the present Kaiser, said in the winter of 1913-14, that either before he became Kaiser, or after, there would be war, as he said, "for the fun of the thing," and to the American to whom he said this, (as quoted by Ambassador Gerard,) he declared: "The plan is to attack and conquer France, then England, and after that the United States of America; Russia was also to be conquered, and then Germany would be master of the world." May I remark in passing that three years have passed and he has not yet captured Verdun, from which we may entertain the hope that his plan is doomed to failure.

If the conceited aspirations of these two strange and yet very influential characters, father and son, had been theirs alone, no one would have feared. But not only did the five hundred men in Potsdam agree to the Kaiser's proposal, the profoundest thinkers and most influential citizens of Germany have also indorsed what he then proposed. Even before his time they had intended it and now they assisted him to make it more probable.

Among these supporters was Heinrich von Treitschke, the greatest of German political philosophers in our time, who, born in 1834, began

his public work in 1859 by lecturing at the Leipzig University, on the State. From that he went to other universities, to Kiel, Freiburg, Heidelberg, and at length to Berlin, and through all his life until 1895, he was the exponent of the Pan-German idea which the Kaiser had unfolded in 1892, after Von Treitschke had urged it long before. He was the friend of the Kaiser and his written history is a glorification of the house of Hohenzollern; he was intimate with Bismarck, he was devoted to Germany and the Prussian policy. He taught that power is the first principle of the State, that the individual had no rights apart from those allowed by the State, and that the State, the German State, could not do an immoral thing. He held that might was the only right, so that if there is power to do a thing and a power to will, then the State has the right to do whatever it has the might and the will to do.

Devoted as he was to this conception of the State, he was equally sure that Germany is the greatest State in the world and of right ought to dominate all other States. He taught that the Hohenzollerns should dominate Prussia, for the good of Prussia, that Prussia should dominate Germany for the good of Germany, and that Germany should dominate the world for

the good of the world. He expressed his intense contempt and hostility for most States other than Germany. He was the most popular professor in the universities and on the platforms of any in Germany from 1866 to 1895, training generations of students, and the recognised leader of the political life of that great empire.

Von Treitschke held that Germany should dominate the world through its army, and so doing, argued for the leading idea of the policy of Frederick the Great in the second half of the eighteenth century; that the army should be one with the State and the State should be one with the army, and that whatever the State wished to do, it should do through the army by war. Therefore, there could be no human fraternity excepting inside the limits of the German Empire, and all States outside were natural and rather contemptible enemies.

In order that the army might work its will on all other States than the German State, Von Treitschke held that its activity should be without any limits of morality or any restraints of humanity; that the army's work should be ruthless; that they should slaughter, torture, rob and starve as they pleased, provided it was necessary for the power of the German State, and that spying and lying were privileges of the State

which everybody should understand, were to be used without explanation or apology. He further affirmed that no religion, no system of morals, no international law, no treaty, should stand between the will of the State, expressed in the army by force and power, and their desires and designs. Nowhere in all the seventeen volumes of his published works did he say one word against war. He praised it rather as being desirable and necessary, and as indicating the virility of the State. To seek to put an end to war was immoral and unwise. As he with extraordinary energy and unequalled popularity lectured and taught for thirty-five years, generations of university men and military men accepted his principles and passed them on. They taught the students in the universities, and appealed directly to the people. The students of Von Treitschke are now the university Professors of History throughout Germany.

Among those accepting and teaching these theories is Otto Richard Tannenberg, who in 1911, at Leipzig, published a volume extensively influential—"The Greater Germany, the Work of the Twentieth Century." In this volume the author laid out a complete plan for the mastery of the whole world by the German Empire. He told what they should do and how to conquer

and control central and western Europe. He openly held, as have many other German authors, that the neutral states of western Europe, were to be used as buffer states in the great world war that was coming; they would not, because they were little, dare to refuse Germany all the provisions that they could raise or smuggle in. They would, being neutral, bar the passage into Germany of hostile armies. At any moment Germany could take Holland, Denmark, Sweden and Norway. It was better to have them neutral for the service they would render; but only for a time, because ultimately they were all to be absorbed into the German Empire.

He pointed out how Belgium, northern France, then all western France should come under German dominion; sketched the plan by which Russian Poland should be made German, and the western part of Russia should be Germanised. He saw Austria-Hungary as practically a vassal of the German Empire, and how by subjugating the Balkans and Turkey, the Pan-German plan from Hamburg to Bagdad, from the North Sea to the Persian Gulf, could be worked out; thus along the line of the least resistance how to gain the control of the East.

He described how they would by that route go to India and gain control of it, and entering

China, acquire dominant influence there. He laid his plans for the absorption of the whole of Africa, all the colonies of all States to be taken over by Germany.

After this, Tannenberg by maps and details, pictured and indicated how South America was to be Germanised; and the procedure which, carried on with determination and duplicity, should bring all of the South American States under German control. Going on from that, flouting the Monroe Doctrine and so challenging the United States, they would at length possess themselves of North America. Having meanwhile overpowered England and France, they would be in control of the whole world. This was the modest plan of Otto Richard Tannenberg, a scheme immensely popular from the time his work was issued in 1911, and which greatly stimulated the present war of conquest.

The same expectation marked the threat of Admiral Von Goetzen, an intimate friend of the Kaiser, who said to our Admiral Dewey before Manila in 1898, that, "In about fifteen years, my country will begin a great war. Some months after we have done our business in Europe, we shall take New York and probably Washington, and we shall keep them for a time. We do not intend to take any territory from you, but only

to put your country in its proper place with reference to Germany. We shall extract one or two billions of dollars from New York and other towns." This, Admiral Von Goetzen had the audacity to say to Admiral Dewey. If he had possessed a little more sense, he might have remembered that another German Admiral, Von Diederich, undertook to interfere with Admiral Dewey at Manila and was told that if he really wanted to fight, he could have the privilege then and there. The American Admiral cleared his ships for action, the British Admiral stood by Dewey, and, of course, Diederich found that to insult America was not safe. It may have dawned upon him that to take the American continent might be difficult. The date named by Von Goetzen fifteen years in advance, was correct as to the beginning of the war.

Thus the spokesmen of the Kaiser announced their policies and spread them among the people until the entire German nation absorbed their ideas and agreed to them, setting themselves to the task of conquering and enslaving the world.

Their principal obstacle in the way of this plan of world dominion was England, which they hated with a deadly hatred. You cannot imagine, because you are gentlemen, in what language the great philosophers of Germany de-

nounced England, the British nation (in speech so insulting that if passed between men, it would be an occasion for immediate conflict); so furthering and feeding their plan and purpose to excite their people to such animosity that they would express themselves in deeds of inhumanity and in Hymns of Hate. At first they howled these against England only. But high authority now says they have transferred their direst hatred from England to America. Why did they hate England? Because they saw in the British Empire the chief impediment to their unholy ambition. They doubted greatly if they could conquer with England opposing them. With their conceit they boasted it, but in their hearts they knew better.

And when America entered the war, they knew positively that their game was up; that Britain and America co-operating, the Central Powers were doomed to defeat. This is why they hate. Remember it and beat them to the dust. By their ferocity, you can imagine how they hate. In an interview of our ambassador with the Kaiser, that ruler said to him: "America had better look out after this war," and, "I shall stand no nonsense from America after this war." This threat the Kaiser made to the ambassador of the United States. Would he have made the

threat unless he meant to execute it? Our ambassador tells us that the Germans "absolutely despised" the military and naval power of the United States, and were "unanimous in saying that as a military or naval factor the United States might be considered as less than nothing," offering no impediment to their designs and intentions. South America also bears her share of the contempt and antagonism of the German Empire.

In South America, through which they were to approach us, remember that there were four hundred thousand Germans in southern Brazil twenty years ago, and nearly a hundred thousand in other South American States, and that a propaganda has been carried on through all the southern half of South America for many years by Germany; a propaganda of persons, of literature, of newspapers, of subsidised schools, to entice and betray those people into subjection under the German yoke. Brazil has just awakened to it and has lately struck back. It is the evident intention and fixed purpose of Germany to change the free governments of South America into dependencies of the German Empire.

Everywhere, in all the world, they have pushed their subtle and treasonable propaganda. It was

in the interest of the German intention to bring America under their control that Prince Henry came here before he went to China. When he went to China, as you know, to seize Kiau Chau, the Kaiser ordered him and his troops, "Make yourselves more frightful than the Huns under Attila. See that for a thousand years no enemy mentions the very name of 'Germany' without shuddering."

Prince Henry, while our guest honoured and feted by us, was an agent of the German propaganda to organise the Germans of America, of whom there were some fourteen or fifteen millions, so that, in the present crisis, for which they were organised, they would stand with the Kaiser instead of being loyal to the United States Government. The Prince left behind in Washington as a token of German friendship, a statue of that forerunner of the Kaiser, unsurpassed in duplicity, having a bad eminence in rascality as well as in military power, Frederick the Great. I wish we might change that statue into good munitions and send it back to Germany.

And so concerning all parts of the world, the Germans openly avowed and secretly wrought out their purposes of conquest. Do not think for one moment that I am saying anything which is not amply warranted by their own statements.

They openly made them, but nobody really believed them. They said: We are going to conquer the world, and we doubted that they would even try. But, let me tell you that they have done as they threatened; they have done much and most of all they planned as far as they have had the power to do it.

II

What have they already accomplished? To what extent have they succeeded? They intended, as they announced, to gain control from Hamburg and the North Sea to Bagdad and the Persian Gulf.

They have already done most of this. They have conquered Belgium; they intended to. We have the German Governor von Bissing's last will and testament, concerning the politics of the German Empire, in which he shows us that from before the beginning of this war they fully intended to take Belgium entirely to themselves and to keep it. No matter how much lying they have done, that was what they intended to do, and up to now they have done it.

They have taken northern France. They have nearly all (about eighty per cent.) of the iron ore and the coal of France, both which are vital

to that nation's life. They have held it for three years and a half, keeping it from France and working it for themselves. We speak of France being "bled white," but the bleeding of France through the taking of her treasures of coal and iron has been almost as destructive as the bleeding of France in taking the blood of her men. In 1870 they seized Alsace and Lorraine for the same reason: to secure France's supply of minerals and metals so necessary to her industries and her economic life.

They have taken Russian Poland. Before that they had Austrian Poland and German Poland.

They have Austria-Hungary completely in their power, with German mastery in their army and German control in their finances. They have Bulgaria; they possess Serbia, which they have brought down to the dust; they hold Montenegro; Rumania and Russia are at their mercy; they rule the whole Turkish empire with its twenty millions of people, a hundred per cent. of it. In a word, if you study the map as it now is, you will find that so far as the first move which the Kaiser declared that they intended to make, they have gained (in Europe and Asia) most of what they said they were determined to conquer and possess. This is very startling when you

consider farther facts in connection with their present and projected conquests.

Had Britain delayed declaring war a few days more, and had not the British fleet blocked their way, Germany would have seized the Channel ports, Dunkirk, Calais and Bordeaux, and held all the west of France; would have commanded the Channel; would have dominated all France; would have invaded England; would have swept out of the North Sea ports and covered the waters of the Atlantic Ocean with their fleets, and would have been in the United States of America, firmly established three years ago. The reason why Germany did not do this was, not because we were "too proud to fight," but because Belgium, France and Great Britain, for love of liberty and humanity, fought for us and died for us while we stood supinely by. But for their defence of us, the heel of the German invader would have been on the neck of North America to-day, and no human power, other than of those who so stood fast and fought, could have helped it. If now, after three years and a half of the war, if now, after a year of preparation on our part, we are yet entirely unready to repel the attack of a trained army, what would have been our status if the German fleet had escaped from the North Sea at first, and with little diffi-

culty, had steered their course to our ports, undefended as they would have found them at that time? Bear in mind, when we are now asked to fight, if we were from now on, to be alone fighting for Belgium, France and England, and for two years time, we would only be paying the debt that we owe them for having saved us from the horrors which Germany has carried to every country where it has won power and dominion.

What of Germany to-day as a military power? I quote Ambassador Gerard as a thoroughly informed witness. He says in the Foreword of his book that to-day "the military and naval power of the German Empire is unbroken." That it now has not less than nine millions of men, veterans of war, four hundred thousand being added by those growing up to military age every year; that there is no likelihood of their suffering for lack of food; that the danger of starvation is greater to our allies than it is to Germany. It has really little financial difficulty, so far as known to us, because they fully planned, and intend taking all the wealth they can possibly plunder from the nations that they have seized and hold. They fully purpose and expect to compel Britain, France and the United States to pay their war debt. That is their settled design, and to-day, the gains of plunder and loot,

and the full payment of their debt, by tribute levied, are among the greatest motives which keep the German armies in the field, buoying them up with the hope of conquest and the expectation of adequate enrichment through tribute and plunder.

In the presence of these conditions what think you? Are we in peril? The German fleet is intact. Nothing keeps it where it is but the British fleet and our fleet now helping; ours, a small and inadequate fleet, to be increased, we devoutly hope, as rapidly as possible. With their fleet, and their army, their prestige, their training and supplies (for they had munitions, as it was reported, for thirty millions of men when they started this war); with all these, when I warn you that even now, unless a gracious Providence interferes and something more than unarmed men are put in the field against them, they will land here as conquerors and work their will, I am only telling you what must be plain to your common sense and a trumpet call to your patriotism.

III

And here let me ask you what they do to a land when they conquer it? Proposing to Germanise the world, what are they going to do with

the world which they Germanise? What is their idea of Germanising Belgium, or of Germanising northern France, or Serbia, or Poland, or Armenia? What is their method? Here is my answer: Where they make conquest, they pay not the slightest respect to any law of morals, humanity, honor or right. This indictment is amply supported by the most indubitable testimony. Of the horrible and sickening details of their fiendish and devilish savagery only a part is printed. But the governments of the allies have as much of their record as can be put into words. Volume upon volume of unimpeachable and fully attested testimony proves their guilt. The names of these witnesses would fill volumes. Some of these I know. Their testimony I have heard. From these sources I may present to you a brief suggestion of what the Germans do when they have the power. Consider that what they have done where they have gained the power, they will do everywhere when they shall gain it.

They have no love for us. Belgium had done them no harm. France had done them no more; Serbia had not assailed them; Russian Poland had shown no unfriendliness. Yet all these they have ravaged with unrestrained ferocity. When you dream that because you are Americans the German hordes once here would treat you better

than they have treated Belgium, better than they have treated France, you are labouring under a delusion that has no possible justification in experience or reason.

What have they done with the people where they gain control? Without hesitation or provocation they have proceeded to massacre, unrestrained, frightful, horrible. Whole cities and villages they have wiped out. A German soldier, riding a bicycle, falls; his rifle is discharged. They accuse some of the inhabitants of having shot at their soldier. They deliberately burn every house, they ravish and kill the women and girls, they murder, sometimes crucifying the little children; they shoot the old men and the old women, take hostages and slay them. They burn the towns, the chateaux, the libraries, churches, farmhouses, all the homes. This they have done not once, but they have done it hundreds of times to hundreds of towns in northern France and in Belgium. They have carried out massacre so bloody, carnage so inconceivably horrible, with torture so fiendish, that the wildest fury of the red Indian of North America is not to be compared with the deliberate ferocity of the German officers and soldiers.

Almost beyond this in cruelty, wickedness and destructiveness is the deportation of citizens,

dragged from their homes as slaves to wherever the German powers order them to go. In an official document of the American Red Cross, you may read of the city of Mons, where six thousand two hundred men and boys were dragged from their homes at half past five in the November morning; the best citizens in Mons, the humblest as well as the highest, all the great men of that province, lawyers, statesmen, heads of trades, all commanded to go to the railway station. There were cattle cars with the filth of their lately transported cattle in them. The men are forced into these cars. One is taken and another is left. A boy prays that he may go in the place of his old father. He is kicked aside; the old father is taken. The women and children come begging to be allowed to give comforts to their men. Not one of them is permitted to approach. The deported though taken at that hour in the morning, are none of them allowed to receive anything, either food or clothing, or comforts of any sort. They know not where they are going. They are cruelly dragged away. The city from which they were torn is left in anguish. It existed as a funeral scene. Day and night were filled with the woe of the women and the wailing of the children.

Those thus deported go for days without

water, without food, in suffering untold, until they are dumped somewhere in Germany, where they are ordered to work for the Germans. The witness, Mr. John H. Gade, of Mr. Hoover's staff, went with them to the cars, pleaded for them in vain. He saw them come back after three weeks, broken, dying, dead. A more diabolical form of slavery was never known. This one story is so inconceivably cruel, that its details are too horrible for words.

And it is but one of hundreds and thousands like it. Turn to Armenia and Syria, whose deportations were done on advice from the Germans to the Turks and Kurds, who simply followed and repeated what Germans had planned, ordered, begun and done in Belgium and in northern France. Here were two millions of people, the best people in the Turkish Empire, many of them highly educated, many of them graciously refined, their wives and daughters as lovely as our own, many of the men equals of our noblest men. See them deported, dragged from home, driven to the desert, stripped naked, ravished to death, poisoned, starved to death, stabbed, thrown into the rivers to drown, or left to perish with thirst on the sands of the desert. This is a suggestion of what deportation is, the infliction of agonies which beggar description.

Two millions of the Armenians have perished within the last three years under this system of "Germanising the world." The like of this has been practised in every land where Germany has come as a conqueror. Missionaries, even German missionaries charge it to Germany.

Consider the actual enslavement of populations, where peoples are compelled to toil not only without compensation, but under the most cruel conditions, for their military masters; where men are beaten with the butts of guns until the guns are broken, because they decline to work for these slave drivers; where they have been hung up by their hands for thirty hours, to force them to do a work that international law says they shall never be asked to do.

Take note of the way in which the conquered are robbed of all that they possess. Their furniture is stolen, or if not stolen, is defiled and defaced. Prince Eitel Frederick, one of the sons of the Kaiser, after using an old French chateau which was a wonder of architecture and had been admired for centuries, stripped it of all its furniture, to send away for his use, and at the last, though he had promised to spare it, when leaving it, ran back with bombs and combustibles, to see to it that the chateau was burned, its lurid flame revealing his eternal dishonour. Such deeds have

been done not merely once, but unnumbered times.

The Huns in Belgium and France stole the underclothing of the women and little children; the mattresses from the beds, the bed blankets; destroyed all farm implements, sent the machinery in the Belgian and French factories to Germany, and then blew up the factories. Such in part is the conduct of Germans in regard to persons, goods and property. All the cattle are killed or driven off; all the horses likewise. Thousands of girls taken off by force; in numerous towns, all girls over fifteen years of age, carried off, nobody knew where; and of the thousands, only a few hundred ever returned to the places from which they were taken.

A distinguished representative of the Young Men's Christian Association, just back from France, said in my hearing a few days ago, that in many of the towns in France, all girls over fifteen years of age had been dragged away, forced from home, as servants for German officers, driven to Germany to work in the fields, seized as the prey and the spoil, not of brutish men—there are no brutes like these men—but of these fiends escaped from hell, who in their actions deny that a woman is a human being, entitled to reverence and protection.

Nietzsche, the chief philosopher of Germany, most influential now and for years, despising women, says they have value only as playthings for and as breeders of the "superman." He writes "A man of depth can only think of women as a piece of goods that can be put under lock and key"; also that, "a man who went among them, ought to go among them with a whip." His "superman" is strong with no morals, being superior to morality. Hear me as I tell you that wherever any philosopher, or any person, despises woman, rails at her, degrades her, abuses her, that one is a devil, in whatever guise.

What cruelty have they not perpetrated? Imagine something horrible of which perverted men are capable. Of such imagined wickedness, I can think of nothing which they have not done.

For years we have kept the Belgians alive, with the help of Great Britain and France, or rather Britain and France kept them alive with our help, for they gave much more than we did. We sent supplies there by millions of dollars worth, to keep them from hunger and cold. In not a few instances, the Germans stole the food sent. In some cases, they stole the goods and shipped them away. In other instances, they used them. And yet again, they adulterated the foods we sent by putting with the grains, their stuff of

inferior quality, while they took the rest. All Belgium would have been dead of starvation today if it had not been for outside philanthropy, not German. Germany would have starved them and intended to do it. We have in proof the statement of von Bissing himself, quoted as he stated it to Mr. Frederick Walcott, associate of Mr. Hoover. Von Bissing distinctly said that their purpose was to reduce to starvation these Belgians, and when they were reduced to starvation, to send them to work in Germany, so as to allow German working men to go to the front; and also to carry others to Mesopotamia and Eastern Asia to work for Germany.

We hear him talk about forcing men, women and little children to starvation and showing not a trace of human feeling. Never, so far as I know, were such abominations wrought in the history of time, as they have wrought in the lands where they have gained the power.

Let me repeat what I have already said: Do not imagine for one moment that you, your wife, your daughter, would be any more sacred to them than a Belgian or a Belgian's wife or a Frenchman's family. Do not dream that your babies would be any more exempt from the cruelty of those Germans than other babies have been. Do not suppose that your dearest, most

beautiful and most precious ones would have any defence in their being Americans more than those others whose defences have all been broken down.

I have told you but little—and not the worst. You cannot doubt or deny the testimony. Remember that just as soon as these plundering, murdering Germans have evacuated those French and Belgian villages, without delay government officials have gone there to take photographs, and other legal testimony, to get the plain facts, to record them with affidavits, so as to lay them up for the day of Judgment. And the day of Judgment in the purpose of those whose friends have suffered thus, is not merely when the great God shall summon men before His bar to answer for the deeds done in the body, but when the triumphant allies, representing a just God and an outraged humanity, shall set a day of recompense, and shall judge and consign to their just doom and penalty, those who are proved by their crimes to be unfit to live in this world or in any other.

Thus they are treating the conquered peoples. As for the wealth of the conquered, they take it all. Are you informed about the late German retreat where they wilfully and maliciously destroyed everything destructible? They poisoned the springs, the wells, the brooks. They had

poison to give to the cattle, if any should survive. This they planned would be communicated to the people, so that cattle and people alike should all perish through this malicious and savage means. They have tried thus to ruin France, Belgium, Serbia, Poland, Roumania, so that language fails us to describe their plots and their destructive cruelty.

How this tide of testimony rises, surge on surge. It is a great, a stormy ocean of facts, undeniable, incontrovertible, horrible, that are known to God and known to men, facts which tell you what the German means by conquest, as he goes out to Germanise the world.

IV

Beyond all these evils which have been inflicted and to which we are exposed, I now come to the peril which covers and includes all the perils which I have before named, multiplying and intensifying them; that is, THE PERIL OF A PREMATURE PEACE. By a premature peace, I mean a German peace, a peace without an allied victory. I mean a drawn battle, a peace without justice, or without the overthrow of the military power of Germany, without the destruction of their

claims and pretensions, and on making which peace, the world would hope to settle back for a while into what is fondly and foolishly called peace.

The Germans began this war; about that there never will be any contention or successful contradiction. When they began it, England had an army of two hundred and fifty thousand men. Germany had an army of ten million men. England's army was unready. Germany's army was all ready to the last button. This being so, can anybody suppose that Great Britain was prepared? In the last two and one-half years, Great Britain has raised, almost entirely by volunteering, over four millions of men, with all their equipment, and with heroic Belgium and France has held Germany's millions in check. And this is a bare fraction of what Britain has done.

Germany was ready. On the fifth day of July, in 1914, at Potsdam we have learned that a meeting was held, in which an agreement was made with the General Staff—and Austria knew of it —that the war should begin at the end of that month. War was declared, on the 31st of July. The central powers have pretended they were surprised. If you want to vision the magnitude of falsehood, growing out of their theory that truth has no binding force, read the German

documents which tell their story of Germany's action in the last few years, and especially since this war began. They were ready, they were precipitately ready, and when the moment came, they went into the conflict fully prepared.

They said they did not wish to take Belgium and that it was wrong to violate its neutrality: but they are on record as having also said they would take it and hold it always, and that is what they are going to do if they possibly can.

But now, as it is true that they began the war, from them only has come the cry for peace. You may notice, that all the movements for peace have come either from the Germans or from their bloodless tools, the pacifists; or from their treacherous servants, the Socialists, in Europe and America. This cry of theirs for peace has been always an utterly false and deceitful cry. They have said peace when they meant war and conquest.

Whether peril be here or there, whether it be the Germans, by one means or another, this is the main fact: All the peace propaganda have started from Germany. Why is this so? Have they said: "We seek peace because we are beaten?" No! They have proudly boasted whether advancing or retreating, "We are victorious, victorious everywhere."

Then we ask: "Are they remorseful for what they have done?" Not in the least. They glory in their deeds. Their soldiers, exulting, write home even to their wives and sweethearts, about the girls they have ruined, of the villages they have burned, of the slaughter they have done. Each soldier carries a little iron medal on one side of which is a picture, supposed to represent the German deity, who holds a weapon in his right hand, and these words addressed to the soldier: "Strike your enemy dead. The day of Judgment will not ask you for your reasons." These savages are not remorseful. Not for such cause do they seek peace.

Are they exhausted? No, they are not exhausted. Gerard says they are full of strength and a very great peril to us to-day. Then, why are they suggesting peace? Let me tell you: So as to more perfectly execute their scheme of conquest. They have about three hundred million people—a conservative estimate—under their control at the present time—77 millions Germans and 223 millions non-Germans. They hold all of Belgium and all of northern France; they practically have Austria-Hungary and all of Poland; they have Bulgaria, Roumania, Serbia; they have Turkey and much of western Russia, so if they could now stop a little while, having

increased from sixty-eight millions in Germany when this war began, to about three hundred millions now, they would have opportunity to greatly consolidate their strength.

It has been suggested that they might, for the sake of peace, give up Belgium. Officially, they never have intimated it. Other people may suppose it, but they have never implied it. They might restore northern France. They might pay an indemnity for what they have destroyed. They have never given evidence of any such intention. They might temporarily give up some territory, provided they were allowed now to have peace. But, however they gain their ends, this is what they plan and what they purpose: They intend, if they can deceive the allies into making peace, to take a few years of rest and reorganisation, when they will be able to put into the field an army of thirty millions of men, gathered from those whom they have subjugated and whom they can compel to go into the ranks; and with that army and with their navy, continually increased; with all the appliances of modern warfare, after a brief period of preparation, they purpose to finish just what they started to do: to Germanise the world. If we are beguiled now into a drawn battle, if we make a false peace with them, we are defeated;

liberty is crushed and the whole world is doomed.

Do not for one instant suppose that it is any goodwill toward you, or any goodwill toward the world, or any thought that peace is more desirable than war, which is working in the German mind at the present time. Far from it. They are working for dominion; they are battling for triumph; they are struggling to possess the wealth of the world; they are plunderers, just as were the old Huns, Vandals and Goths. They want to grasp the wealth of the world. They have taken it as far as they could get it. How they get it they do not care. They are ready to drench the whole world with blood to make this Kaiser—who says he is Godsent, who talks about God as though he owned Him—to make this ruler the autocrat of the whole world.

So all the perils hitherto mentioned lie visible and measureless in the direction of a premature peace. There is only one alternative now for the allies, slavery or victory, and the question is—which do we claim, and which will we take?

V

Not yet have I named all the treasures that

we are likely to lose, if Germany is allowed to win. Let me briefly name a few of them. Certain things are exceedingly precious to us, which we, as Americans, have grown to feel are essential, which our fathers fought to procure, and which we must fight to preserve. These are the very things which we are sure to lose provided Germany has her will and her way. The first of these, for which we ought to contend with a vigour born of highest principle and the noblest heroism, chief among priceless things is liberty; liberty as contrasted with slavery. It needs little definition. While the slave belongs to a master, the freeman belongs to himself. While the slave does not own his family, the freeman and his family possess each other. While the slave cannot claim property, the freeman possesses his earnings. The slave is ruled by his master's caprice: the freeman by the laws which he sanctions and reveres.

Whatever there is in liberty, which has called forth the fervour of the heart in all ages of upward advance in human history, that we are in danger of losing. Have I not already proved this? What else are Belgians than slaves when they are dragged from their homes and forced to work for a master who is driving them to a task which they hate? What shall we say of the en-

slaving of men when they can be taken as they were taken at Mons, at Dinant, and many another city; shipped to another country and forced to work for a foreign master, under the most cruel conditions? What say we of those who in prison camps—two millions of them, as Gerard says—were compelled to work for Germany or starve? forced to work for Germany and against their own people? What shall we expect of the possibilities of liberty, of the right of a man to himself, when Germany rules? There will be no liberty. It will all be slavery. How long could we exist in such conditions? And would not multiplied cruelties break our hearts and crush our manhood?

Sometimes the effort has been made to lead Belgians and Frenchmen to go voluntarily to work in Germany. I heard the Attorney-General of Belgium tell this story of the unbroken spirit of his fellow-countrymen: A company of captive Belgian men were gathered and a German officer urging them to go to Germany to work for their captors, said to them:

"If you go to Germany and work for us, you will get money, so that you can keep your families from starving and yourselves also. If you refuse to go, you will starve without pity and your families also will starve."

Imagine this alternative put up to us now. How would we meet it? The Belgians stood there, ragged, tattered and hungry, their families behind them. Not a man of the company moved to accept the German offer. At length one man stepped out from the ranks and said: "I will go!" The German officer was pleased. He thought that his threats had prevailed, and he said: "You will go, my man?" The Belgian assented.

"Now, men," said the officer, "look here. Here is one of your number who is willing to go, and you had better do as he does."

Then insinuatingly, he asked the Belgian volunteer: "What is your business?"

The man answered: "I am a gravedigger, and I shall be glad to serve Germany in that capacity."

So with starvation facing them, despising their persecutors, the Belgians preferred liberty to slavery; they would rather die freemen than live slaves.

Every true American, the humblest and the highest, thanks God every day for freedom, and prefers war to slavery. Shall Germany then make slaves of us by a premature peace?

Remember another precious thing that we should lose by German victory. We should lose honour. And by losing honour I mean we would

accept dishonour. Germany has no sense of honour. You know what honour is, a man's honour, a woman's honour. How delicate and noble a thing it is, and how precious. If you give your word, you keep it not merely because you know you would be a liar if you broke it, but because your honour prevents you from denying what you have agreed to. Honour is such a treasure in character and action, that we preserve it at all costs, so that I may say of many of you that you would give up life sooner than surrender honour.

How then could you obey the mandates of Germany to betray your country? The Belgian has sworn loyalty to Belgium, the Frenchman to France. Its constitution is his constitution. It is his country. His life is devoted to it. Germany arrests him and commands: "Go and work in our machine shops, at our lathes, in our factories, in our fields, to produce material for us to use in destroying your country."

He answers: "I cannot."

They insist: "You must."

He replies: "I have given my oath of allegiance to my own country, and if I work for you to destroy it, I am a traitor to my country."

They compel him with torture. The International Congress at the Hague agreed that under

no circumstances should nations at war undertake to compel peoples or prisoners to work against the interests of their own country. No man can keep honour and betray his own people. But Germany is attempting to force patriots into disloyal relations to their own country.

They are doing there only what they would do here. You might be ordered to work for them against our own people. You might be constrained by them to make the American flag a dishonoured symbol of slavery. Would you do it? Victorious they would try to make us do it, and they would put all their power behind their effort. I hope it never will come to this test here as it has come in France and Belgium. Yet it surely will if we consent to a false, a premature peace.

I might speak of humanity, that gentle and gracious spirit and action which prevails among people when inhumanity would be a sin and a crime. You all know and feel the difference between humanity and inhumanity, between kindness and cruelty, between mercy and savagery. Toward all the weak and needy, to the aged, to women and little children, humanity demands care, gentleness, reverence, protection, assistance. These gracious feelings and duties Germany reviles and despises. What will you say of those

who slaughter little children, ravish young women, murder the aged, abuse the prisoners? Merciless murder, insane lust, unrestrained savagery, fiendish cruelty are common and have been constant at the hands of German officers and soldiery ever since the war began. The testimony is voluminous, incontrovertible and from unnumbered reliable sources.

A young Armenian in my hearing told us how the Turks took men and women of the highest character and culture (his own parents among them) from the city and under German influence, tortured and crucified them with devilish inhumanity; of 549 men, he alone was left; of 2000 women all but 200 had been put to death or lost to their friends by cruelties so infamous that hearing of them is almost more than we can endure.

Shall we be deprived of the privilege of being kind? Shall we be denied the power of defending women and little children? Shall the aged have no reverence? Shall the helpless have no care? That is what Germany would crush us down to when they had reduced us to their control. Do you consent to pay this price for a premature peace?

The same is true of morality. Numberless scenes and events support my statement. They

despise morals, possess none, and seek to destroy them in others.

As to mercy an American writer tells us that he went to Berne and saw there a large number of allied officers who had been prisoners and who had been sent over from Germany into Switzerland on account of their ill health. He said those officers told him that when captured, they were put into cattle cars and sent to the prison camps. On the way they were thirty-six hours without water and as long a time without food. When they stopped at stations, they saw women on the platforms with water in pails and in cups. When they besought them, and offered to pay them for a drink of water, the women would sometimes come forward with a cup full, reach it toward the parched and famishing man and then spill it on the ground and sneer and laugh at these thirsty and dying sufferers. Even the women of Germany have lost their humanity, and their moral sense, when they do thus.

Mercy has gone from the German. Pity he does not know, and he would just as soon practise unmercifulness and inhumanity on you as on anybody. How strange it seems to read their own words in testimony of the exultation, of the orgies at night of these assassins. After the burning of a village, the slaughter of men, the

rape of women, the destruction of little children, how horrible it is to find the men rejoicing, carousing, singing, because of the wonderful things they had wrought that day! And such orgies you will behold here if you see the Germans reinforced by a premature peace.

Perhaps I have revealed as much as you will remember, yet not enough to half unveil what is in my mind of the perils of this hour. What shall we do now in the face of this supreme danger? Shall we be awake to it? Or shall we be indifferent? Shall we be reluctant to take alarm? Shall we crave a peace so deadly? Shall we in blind folly aid the enemy? Is there any wisdom in our being overreached, sceptical, cowardly? I could detail to you, how over fifty great outrages have already been committed in our country by German spies within the last year, on munition plants, on great docks and warehouses, on elevators, and in numerous other ways, costing hundreds of millions of dollars and many hundreds of lives, for which not one of those responsible has been punished by anything greater than a short term of imprisonment. Shall we awaken to the fact, that with America it is life or death? We counsel not inhumanity like theirs, not revenge, not hate, not assassination, but that we arise for national defence. We are

choosing liberty or death, now as did our sires in Revolutionary days, and a premature peace is the lull before the hurricane of destruction.

My appeal is to you, Americans and patriots. My appeal is to your manhood, however described; to your nobility, however arrived at, to your will, your intelligence, your devotion, however it may be measured; that you will be among those who will stand forever against this attempt of Germany, by a ruse, to betray and conquer the world.

Until they abandon their avowed purpose of world conquest, and cease to menace the peoples and governments of the earth, until they retire from the territory whereon as armed banditti, they have encamped, until they restore the plunder they have stolen, and rehabilitate the countries which they have devastated, until they make atonement for their awful crimes and consent to obey the laws of honour, humanity, and morality, let us steadily and mightily resent and resist any concession which brings in a truce—a false and premature peace—sure to be used by them to initiate a still more dangerous and terrible war, with consequences more direful, and disasters irreparable. Now and forever let our battle cry be, "Righteousness first, then Peace."

VI

The Wisdom of Men that Was Foolishness with God

"HAS not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?" Concerning what? At least, concerning war and peace. The wisdom of this world is the confidence men have who trust in themselves and do not seek wisdom from God. Such assumed wisdom in the light of God's wisdom, turns out to be foolishness.

Never was this demonstrated more clearly than in the liberal assurances made by so-called wise men, widely given and largely credited, that the world's peace would continue undisturbed, when in truth at that very hour all nations were trembling on the verge of war. We are not intending to inquire into the inexplicable blindness of diplomats, foreign offices, statesmen and rulers. They were caught almost utterly unready when war burst forth. Actually, all the facts were in sight, but the wisdom to draw correct inferences and conclusions they did not possess.

They took little heed of Germany's threats, plans, and preparations, announced and carried

on through decades. They forecast little or nothing which was true but much that was erroneous to the verge of disaster. Was it not because their theories and reasonings were weak even to the limit of folly, while they regarded themselves wise?

God does not make foolish any human course which is not so. He does not find pleasure in thwarting and humbling men. But because they will not receive the instruction which He places plainly before them, He corrects them at the time when their plans end in defeat and their pride in overthrow.

I wish to deal with some elaborate human schemes promising to do away with war, which have been shown by patent facts to be totally inadequate and disappointing.

We have discussed quite at length the causes of the war and have adverted to conditions necessary to ending it wisely and victoriously. Illusions as to how to prevent and how to end wars exist widely and generally which need to be reviewed. These held for many years hitherto as barriers against the strife of peoples and nations have been found futile. The danger is that we will continue to hold them and put our hopes in them. If we do, what can follow but a repetition of our disappointments? If we examine and

disprove them, we may avoid the mistaken confidence which we have formerly placed in them and at least will not be so foolish as to trust them now to stop a war which they could not prevent.

I

Multitudes held four years ago that the prevalence of peace sentiment had made war unlikely if not impossible. For I know not how many years we had been told "there will never be another great war. A world war is impossible." And when we asked a reason for this belief we were assured that peace sentiment universally diffused would prevent it.

They who held this view wrote about it extensively. A great literature of peace grew up and advocates of peace were multiplied. Rich prizes were awarded to those who wrote well in favor of it. Some books and persons became almost world famous for such advocacy. Speakers no less eloquent and confident than these writers convinced themselves and others that war was a thing of the past. True, wars were transpiring, but they did not discourage these oracles. The horrors of war were portrayed. They were pictured and described with realistic precision. Commissions were reporting the Balkan War, whose dead were scarcely yet buried, in 1914, and

that the dreadfulness of war as they had seen and now described it, gave grounds of confidence that such another would not be repeated. It was too dreadful. Humanity would revolt from it. Meanwhile yet others financially endowed peace propaganda on the basis of such sentiment. By these funds peace palaces were built, notably at the Hague, and numerous congresses were held, gathering representatives from many nations. In these congresses convinced specialists who had given much time and thought to the subject, fairly legislated wars off the earth, so far as sentiment could do it. They sent distinguished scholars, publicists, educators, divines, round the world presenting their convictions. And the sentiments of these and their words became the growing literature of the peace propagandists. Of course, most of these gracious advocates could give unnumbered arguments against arms and armies, navies and forts and all that savoured of expenditure for even defensive war. The matter grew; the sentimentalists, if not the sentiment, increased. Their congresses were in session and were being further summoned in July, 1914. The ships and trains had landed many delegates and others were on the way. The deliverances were prepared; the members were ready to report that further war was improbable.

All this: When suddenly, unforeseen, unexpectedly, Germany and Austria-Hungary, for trivial cause, of set purpose, in accordance with fullest readiness and preparation, declared and immediately began war, really upon all the world. They had said that they would do it. They had plotted the course of conquest. They had sneered at peace, and were ready for frightfulness. Unseen, unexpected, because unstudied and ignored, the forces in leash were loosed and the carnival of frightfulness began. The sentimentalists were not only surprised but astounded. They were no less utterly chagrined. They had supposed that they were very influential. They found that they had no appreciable influence on the situation. As specialists they seemed to feel that they should have been consulted. No one asked their opinion. No one waited for their verdict. They were no more influential than chaff before the whirlwind. Their house of cards had utterly collapsed. We speak not in contempt but in sad respect of these. What had they done except to lull to sleep the assailed nations who now sharing the pacifists' hopes, were wholly unready to defend themselves from world robbers and pirates? Many of these, honest and good and amazed, caught up arms with their fellow patriots and sprang into the breach. Others had

got under such headway with their too narrow views that they kept right on prating of peace when there was no peace. And they are at it yet. We neither ridicule nor condemn the peace sentimentalists whose attitude we have outlined, whose prophecies are exploded. We only say that peace sentiment such as theirs was not appreciably influential in even retarding war, did much harm, if some good, and must have rested on a shallow foundation.

Let us add that no greater mistake could be made than to revive it in the same form or to rely upon it in the least to now stop the war which it had no visible influence to prevent. This mistake we greatly fear. Let the lesson of its misapplication and the mischief it has done warn its honest advocates that it is as useless to end as it was powerless to prevent the war. Sentiment has its place. Like ornament on a work of architecture, it may be durable, beautiful and so useful, if the structure which it decorates is firm, solid and built on a much more permanent basis.

II

Education was affirmed to be a sure barrier to war. Perhaps it was the chief line of defence appealed to by those who were convinced that wars were practically a thing of the past.

Education in schools, by books and modern appliances was the peace hope, the prosperity guarantee of the modern world.

True, we knew that education, carried to a high degree, had prevailed in ancient nations and among mediæval peoples, and that this had not assured peace or prevented war. But our claims were to a far superior education. Ours was modern; ours was scientific. The ancient learning was inutile compared with ours. What that of theirs could but feebly influence, ours, all powerful, would control. The philosophy on which we set our hopes was this: Education imparts information; information and knowledge furnish the basis of inference and wide reasoning. Reasoning, in scientific education, becomes prominent, ascendent. Wars and fightings come from passion. Education subjugates and controls passion. Passions rule where ignorance prevails; reason comes with knowledge. So war as always the offspring of the ruder and ungoverned life of men is shut out. No nation is governed by passion now. The spirit, if there is one, is totally mastered by the intellect. We need little to be said of spiritual education but all scientific data are the food of the intellect making for steadiness, calmness, self-interest and self-control. And further, to build high this great

hope of the modern world, this great defensive against war and blind rage and passion, the state and the people poured out unmeasured wealth upon schools of all grades. No expense was considered too great for institutions of learning. Christianity was practically relegated to an inferior place as a world hope. Is proof asked? Here it is: Most great gifts were for education only, not for propagating Christianity. Men of wealth dedicated their riches to schools, to educational foundations. They did this under the advice of leading publicists and their own compliant faith that school education was the greatest good for mankind. See the vast foundations devoted to education nearly all definitely and avowedly secular; pensions specifically withheld from Christian teachers, in Christian schools, however devoted and learned; very meagre gifts to church work and few large gifts to the Christian missions which are the safest and surest agency of international welfare the world ever saw. And buttressing our faith in schools, we were making them not mostly cultural but vocational; not servants of the spiritual life but of skill in handling physical facts and bringing to the educated salaries and profits. Education was accepted without question by most, as the guardian of the well being of the modern world;

guarantor of comity and amity among men and races.

Suddenly, in absolute contradiction to our faith in education as a peace force wiping out war probabilities—Germany, the best schooled, and most advanced in education, modern and scientific, of all the nations of the earth, in a worked up frenzy of greed and a passion for slaughter directly caused by its education, flung to the winds all promises of peace, including morals and humanity, and sprung like a mad dog at the throat of the world. Germany had given model schools to the world, cultural and vocational. It had given us great educators and advanced methods from kindergartens to post-graduate universities. We, the nations, had admired its methods and followed its lead. Our American education had been not a little Germanised. We had conceded German leadership in education. Here was its fruitage—horrible, ungovernable, merciless, inhuman war. The German scholars, best product of its education, hastened to declare their absolute committal to its war purposes and policy. They signed false documents en masse to further their plan of plunder and slaughter.

There was not a phase of their educational scheme which was not put to the uses of despi¢a-

ble cruelty and fiendish passion. All knowledge of physics, chemistry, engineering, was given to the service of slaughter. Their unlikeness to savages consisted only in their more deadly savagery. Their psychology was placed at the service of casuistry and they lied scientifically, if foolishly. They killed humanity and were pitiless as rattlesnakes—as devils.

Such was the surprise which educated Germany gave to the world. Her nearly three hundred thousand teachers, all official slaves of Prussianism, had trained the children from four years old up to maturity to do the will of the state and no other: to worship might as right and to regard as enemies to be exterminated or enslaved, all who resisted their demands. Say, if you will, "Theirs was miseducation." Evidently. And we on German models bent, are also miseducating in so far as we follow them.

The principle at the basis of their education was utter state selfishness, expressed at the top in a monarch crazed by pride; at the bottom in the ravishers of Belgium, France, Serbia and Armenia.

Education of such sort is discredited. Science, knowledge, reasoning, thus appear in no case to subdue passion or to prevent war. Contrariwise, all the forces of German education have inten-

tionally, deliberately and successfully ministered to exactly the diabolical purposes which have given us the past four years of German wickedness and world suffering.

As education, such as we have copied, manifestly does not operate to prevent war, so education will not end it. If we continue to follow the German model, wars will never end but rather will increase. What better course to take I do not discuss here. It is obvious that Germany's education is wholly condemned and ours too, if like it. Put your faith in something different and your money and endowments too. Why not in Christ and Christianity?

III

Evolution, put above God, was to prevent war. I use evolution not as the name of the method and sequences of God's creation, but in that prevailing sense which considers evolution creative and leaves God out; which speaks not of original mind, or plan or planner, or purpose or goal for man and nature, but of things only, and the evolution of things; of matter and force, both non-intelligent, and what they do.

The popular putting of the thought that evolu-

tion was against recurring war is that mankind progresses so and is so evolved that he had come —up to 1914—to an advanced state which made war unlikely, improbable, possibly impossible. The advancement of mankind assured by evolution foretells the end of war. We were supposed to be too far evolved to fight in the old way. So influential is evolution as a theory of the world and its progress that it is largely claimed to be the supreme point of view for the study of men and nature. When we passed the calendar date 1900, some periodicals gathered the opinions of able and representative men as to what was the greatest event that had marked the nineteenth century then ended. I well recall that in these symposiums among these men were several very prominent Christian preachers who asserted that in their judgment, Darwin's "Origin of Species" and promulgation of the doctrine of evolution, often popularly spoken of as Darwinism, was the most conspicuous and noteworthy event of the preceding hundred years. These did not even mention the unequalled movement of Christian foreign missions, too great to be characterised or applauded except in volumes of fact, or the Christian education movement of the Sunday schools of the period. Evolution, as Darwin expressed it, was to them the foremost word of

progress. Our reference to this evolution now is not to discuss it but only to take the point of view which it assumed and implied as to war.

Affirming that we were long ago mere animals, savages later, and cave-men in a higher state, the changes were rung on our evolution from these "jungle" states to our present high civilisation and the actions and the passions we had outgrown and left behind. The animals which we were, had been very savage, warlike, full of bloody, beastly, fighting instinct. These we had left far behind. What propensity we had left in us to do as they once did was only the remnant of animalism, a sort of appendix (war being its irritation, may I say appendicitis), and we were far along in outgrowing that.

Germany led the world in accepting this general doctrine of atheistic evolution. They believed much in materialism, equally in evolution. And studying the matter according to their supposed evolution, they concluded that they were the most evolved, the men farthest removed from the animalism of animal ancestors, the foremost race, people and nation of the earth. As I have elsewhere stated, they proved to themselves in the evolutionary "struggle for life" that they had made the best struggle and as to "the survival

of the fittest" they were the fittest and necessarily the fittest to rule. If they chose to think so, who could gainsay their claim? Their thought was evolution. They were logical. They compared themselves with others and despised them. How could they do this unless really superior? No other people who believed in evolution as the Germans did, could deny their claim to superiority in many lines. But they themselves must determine what their superior evolution demanded of them as their irresistible urge and act. What should it be? They gave their answer in 1914 and till now.

And what have they proved to the intelligent and observing world in these four years? That they are barbarous beyond all barbarians, savage beyond all savages, brutal beyond all brutes. And in doing thus they have disproved the animal origin of their passions and I think I may add the whole theory of the evolutionary origin of man.

Language fails to characterise the deeds of these who claim the highest evolution. No words drawn from the fierceness of the animal creation can describe them fitly. Neither brutality, bestiality, animalism, ferocity tell the whole truth about their spirit and deeds in their methods of carrying on war upon the innocent and defence-

less. No animal of any species ever abused the females of their species as the Germans have abused women and girls. No species of animals ever took pleasure in murdering the young of their species as the Germans have murdered infant children. No beasts ever destroyed with the destructive spirit which has marked German murderousness. The terms which describe their acts and dispositions do not arise from any animal characteristics of lower creatures. You can only feebly portray them in terms of spiritual description, brought down to the vilest manifestation of life. Call them fiends, devils, monsters of cruelty, demons, and even these terms need intensifying to meet the facts. Since they affirm themselves to be the best product of evolution in the present century, yet are visibly worse than the Assyrians of millenniums ago, what promise is there in the evolutionary progress of man which suggests a condition precluding war as a result of evolution?

Evolutionary theories of peace made and kept by men who define it as Germans do, give no hope to the world. Proud atheistic philosophy could not prevent, and will never end war. Such progress is backwards, downwards; no progression but retrogression; not evolution but devolution.

IV

The economic laws associated with the acquiring and distribution of wealth have been alleged as powerful preventives of war.

The acquisition of wealth in all the forms which are destructible is not a rapid and an easy but a slow and difficult task. The wealth of modern times has been won by the work of millions through long and patient effort. More people than ever have had a voluntary part in gaining it and more, therefore, have a strong personal interest in protecting it from waste and destruction.

In the case of the treasures of the past, as in art and architecture, these become more valuable with passing ages. They cannot be replaced. Prized by their custodians in modern society we assume that men would be very reluctant to do anything which would jeopardise them or lead to their destruction. This would tend to opposition to war on the part of mankind. Besides, as wealth is more widely distributed, as more millions of people hold title to and possess property of their own obtained by labor, saved by thrift and guarded by prudence, so these owners would have a corresponding interest in protecting and preserving what they so prize and what has cost

them so much. These all, therefore, dreading the destruction of their property and goods, will be opposed to war.

As our times have seen a great increase of toilers and owners, as intelligence has added to their just estimate of values, a much greater bulk of population would now oppose war as a destroyer of wealth. This would seem to be a reasonable hope and a sound economic barrier to wars. Permanency of residence, ownership, value, knowledge, taste, comfort, all would be on the side of peace if war were proposed. Besides, the prosperity of a people which had greatly increased its material wealth would make them less likely to regard plunder as necessary to their satisfactions. Civilised and enriched they would have no covetous desires to fight for the possession of their neighbours' wealth.

The principle may be good but it must be too weak to rely upon, as instanced by the aggressions of Germany. For this people have had centuries of rather remarkable industrial and material prosperity. Under autocracy they have prospered materially as have democracies.

Yet we behold them making war, despite their riches, for the direct purpose of looting and spoiling other states. They treat war from the

economic standpoint as good business. Prussia has always been a robber state. By theft it has gained most of its territory. The goods of others as spoils of war come easier than by purchase or labour. So their possessions obtained by war incite to more war.

What though from the property side, it was often said that the bankers of Europe, guardians of its wealth, would not allow or finance war. This was an idle dream. And as for property of any kind dissuading its holders from war, the history of the last four years shows that all possessions are at the mercy of the lowest passions of a nation which resolves to gain by robbing other states. The assailant stakes his all. The defender draws on his all to protect what he may. And the householder assailing proves as fierce as the mercenary soldier who owns nothing but his arms. Wealth, luxury, comfort, however gained, held, distributed, are not masters of the passions of men or the policies of nations. Germany held up and robbed France in 1870 of a billion dollars and invaluable provinces, put this in its war chest and resources and planned in 1914 that within six weeks, it would extort at the gates of Paris ten billions more. It is the robber that makes war. And the owner of property must either fight defensively to keep his own or the

robber states would plunder and hold all the treasures of mankind.

V

Once more, we had worked out the theory that commerce would prevent war.

To briefly state the theory it was this: Commerce and trade by sea and land come through acquaintance and mingling of peoples. Of old the stranger was the enemy, the same word designated both. But the pacific purpose of bringing into a community what a people would like to buy and taking out what they would wish to sell, tended at once to a good understanding and to mutual profit.

Moreover, if I trade with you and you have advantage from it, and you with me and I get advantage, we both are pleased with one another and goodwill springs up. Lands and states are visited by commercial agents. Conveniences for travel and transportation of goods are multiplied. Modes of quick and easy communication are established. Good feeling is fostered. So manufactures, exports, exchanges, railways, ships, ports, all the unnumbered agencies of commerce by land and sea are mingling people together for mutual advantage, assuring mutual

respect and barring out all the waste and disadvantages of war.

It was said in 1913 and prior thereto, that the closing of the channels of trade was impossible, unthinkable. They had become necessary for the very existence of nations.

This was a mistake in reckoning. And also commerce instead of being the protection of peace was made by Germany the pretext for war. In their greed and vainglory they did not tolerate the prosperity of others. In their vanity they assumed that they should be first whether they could honestly win precedence or not. Their lack of monopoly of trade and ports they declared contrary to the freedom of the seas. They had all the privileges that others had. They demanded the foremost place. Their trade had greatly increased, but they were impatient because it had not driven other states from the markets of the world. And now to secure what they regard as their right to commercial supremacy, they have turned pirates and assassins on the seas, and robbers and murderers on the land. While allowed access everywhere, they have gone to every place with treacherous purpose to rob, despoil, to wreck and to enslave all lands and peoples.

Has not this crisis proved plainly that com-

merce is not a guarantor of peace, unless all parties to it are ready to be fair, honest and kind, willing participants in each other's prosperity? It makes all possible difference in what spirit commerce is carried on, whether it tends to friendship or to enmity, to peace or war.

The prevention of wars and the prevalence of peace are found in the practise of two principles of statesmanship, namely:

"Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." And, "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so unto them."

These are the righteousness which must always precede peace. In presence of this our philosophy has been proven foolishness.

VII

Spiritual Aims and Gains of the Nation*

ON a former occasion when I was privileged to be your guest, I was expected to address you on "The Aims of Democracy." Circumstances of great moment substituted another speaker who delivered a speech of national and international significance. For those circumstances I am grateful not only because of the results of that rearrangement, but because, by a change of subject, I am now excused from trying to state the Aims of Democracy. For truth to tell, I am not quite assured what those aims are. And if I may confess the fact, I do not feel at all sure that I can tell what democracy is. Lest you may judge me markedly incompetent on this account, may I say that I do not know to whom I could go to get a definition of that democracy of which we talk so largely and so freely. I would not declare that there is not such a definition, widely and generally agreed to, but I do not know what it is or where to go to get it.

We are told that "Governments derive their

*To the New York Republican Club.

just powers from the consent of the governed." This noble phrase from the immortal Declaration of Independence, is sometimes said to contain the adequate definition of a democracy. But this quotation requires explanation. If it means that all governments derive their just powers from the active consent of those governed, we must urge that this is plainly untrue, since the women living under such governments and constituting fully one half of their responsible inhabitants, have rarely or never been asked to consent to any form of government. This fact alone invalidates the quotation as a definition.

If the statement means that all who live under a government must give active or passive consent, it then appears that no government exists wherein there is not a considerable minority which lives in a constant state of protest against it; and these are not all law breakers necessarily, but oftentimes are the most progressive of its people. The truth is that governments derive their just powers not primarily from the consent of men but from the universal and benevolent laws of God, laws not primarily made or amended, neither created nor repealed by any human legislative body. Nor can they ever be. They are the established code of an eternal order.

A few days ago the Premier of Great Britain, Mr. Lloyd George, in a very impressive speech to an industrial Convention, defining democracy, used these words: "Democracy, in plain terms, is the rule of the Majority." But from time to time in our own country, which we claim to be representatively democratic, the Administration, under our system of voting, has been elected by a minority of the voters voting, and a more marked minority of all the legal voters. And in such a case if the administration is partisan, the will of the majority is subordinated to that of the minority. If it is said that the majority passively consent, it would not help matters to say that in a government ruled by a minority to whose rule the majority consents, the result is a democracy. It might be an oligarchy.

Once again, we note that a few days ago, the Japanese who have really an autocratic government, hearing so much said by us and others about our purpose to foster democracy, took alarm and inquired whether they were to understand that we purposed to make of their government a democracy—a natural and very embarrassing question. To this the minister of the United States in their country, replied that—"The allies were fighting not for democracy *in* nations but for democracy *among* nations."

Deft and novel as this turn of speech may be, you cannot suppose that it satisfied the acute Japanese mind. No more does it satisfy our own. It may state a fact or it may not, but if this is the test of democracy then our government in the past, and that of monarchical states which have constitutions and parliaments, are not warranted in being classed as democracies.

Once more, by your leave, I note that a sagacious publicist has recently said, "In an autocracy, the administration directs the people and their representatives; in a democracy, the people direct their administration or administrators." The day after I first read this, the "Overman Bill" was presented to the Senate of the United States, by request of the President, asking that Congress which had recently granted him powers in excess of those of almost any monarch on earth, should add almost indefinitely to those powers. Is it not obvious that the President for practically all the term of his presidency, has constrained and directed the representatives of the peoples, and so the people themselves? If this is true, as it appears to me to be, then this fourth definition of democracy is not applicable to this country.

You have borne with me while I have proved to you that I do not so fully know what democ-

racy is that I would assume to define it or its aims to you. And I shall be very glad if you know so well what I do not know, that I need not try farther to define it.

Our general topic to-day is "The Spiritual Aims and Gains of the Nation." This subject I should be able in some degree to illuminate. I am well aware that I am in the presence of statesmen, lawyers, soldiers, philanthropists and masters of affairs. Each of you knows much that I do not know as well as you know it, about statecraft, law, military affairs, and various specialties relating to the public welfare. Toward your larger knowledge I feel a becoming deference and respect. My specialty is the things of the spiritual life as relating to God and man. Trusting to the large hospitality of your minds, may I be permitted to reveal my own thinking on the subject which, as a minister of God to men, I ought to know more about than any other. Let me speak as a Christian teacher who seeks to have also the vision of a statesman.

All that I say will be within the limits of the defined policies and purposes of that American statesman now everywhere acclaimed as most worthy of the respect and honour of all who love liberty under law, Abraham Lincoln. Of his spiritual vision and piety as applied to the con-

duct of weighty affairs in which he won immortal fame, Mr. James G. Blaine, one of our most honoured names, thus speaks in his "Twenty Years in Congress": "Throughout the whole period of the (Civil) war, he (Mr. Lincoln) constantly directed the attention of the nation to dependence on God. It may indeed be doubted whether he omitted this in a single state paper. In every message to Congress, in every proclamation to the people, he made this prominent.

"In July, 1863, after the Battle of Gettysburg, he called on the people to give thanks because 'It hath pleased Almighty God to hearken to the supplications and prayers of an afflicted people, and to vouchsafe signal and effective victories to the army and navy of the United States,' and he asked the people 'to render homage to the Divine Majesty and to invoke the influence of His Holy Spirit to subdue the anger which has produced and so long sustained a needless and cruel rebellion.'

"On another occasion, recounting the blessings which had come to the Union, he said, 'No human counsel hath devised nor hath any mortal hand worked out these great things. They are the gracious gifts of the Most High God, who while dealing with us in anger for our sins, hath nevertheless remembered mercy.'

"Throughout his entire official career—attended at all times with exacting duty and painful responsibility—he never forgot his own dependence or the dependence of the people upon a Higher Power.

"In his last public address, delivered to an immense crowd assembled at the White House on the 11th of April, 1865, to congratulate him on the victories of the Union, the President, standing as he unconsciously was, in the very shadow of death, said reverently to his hearers, 'In the midst of your joyous expression, He from whom all blessings flow must first be remembered.' "

This reflection of Mr. Lincoln's thought and spirit, attested by his eminent contemporary, may well impress upon us the wisdom and the source of true and immortal statesmanship, and vindicate, if it needs vindication, my purpose to discuss the emergence out of this war of those spiritual certainties which have appeared and will more fully appear to those who watch for the stars which are rising on the brow of this dark and dreadful night.

What broadest principles of enduring life, principles which are momentous and everlasting, essential to the life of human society and the continuance of the civil state, have become clear since the war began and are destined to grow

clearer as long as reason and life last? A selected few of these permit me to discuss.

I

Materialism is Discredited, Stripped and Repudiated

Materialism, affirming physical energy but denying the soul, rejecting God and lightly regarding authoritative morals, has been rampant. Its creed is atheistic; its fundamental theory is of a godless world. It declares matter sufficient unto itself; to produce itself, to account for itself, to guide itself, to be in itself an end and goal, and all without God. It has been assumed, allowed, promulgated, accepted as having its adequate basis in atheistic evolution. Evolution without God, blind, without foresight or mind, if begun at all, proceeding by an irresistible force, (whether backward or forward it offers no criteria to prove), in which human life appears as other life appears, doing what it must, without controlling volition and without either duty or obligation—this had become the conceived background, the alleged cause, the assumed uncontrolled certainty in individual and collective life.

Germany, possessed with this prevalent idea, has exalted to the position of axioms of interpretation in social and national life, the two fundamental passwords, supposed to govern the origin of species, namely, "The struggle for life," and the "Survival of the fittest." They were logical in assuming that if these tests are true anywhere, they are true everywhere; that if they apply to the human species at all they apply to it always and under all circumstances. What is more natural or pleasing in their life than to conclude, as they might say, irresistibly, that they, as individuals and as a people, had made the "struggle for life" in competition with other peoples, and had proved in themselves by their superiority, as they conceived it, that their fitness was the fitness of "the fittest" and their "survival" was actually and prophetically assured. This they had the courage to affirm. In so doing, their main premise being allowed, they were perfectly logical. They were carrying their theory to its practical application and limit.

Out of this process emerged, for Nietzsche, "The Superman" which (or who) is the finality in his conception and philosophy of the individual, and that of Germany which follows him. The "superman" is he who is superior to all but himself, superior to all law but that of his own

volition, a perfect egoist, who, untrammelled and of necessity, sacrifices all to himself. In self-assertion he holds his might to be the only right, and he practically worships himself, his own desires and his own will.

Treitschke, chief of German's political philosophers, their acknowledged master, at first strongly averse to Nietzsche, later took advantage of the latter's suggestion to affirm, the "superstate" as the one and only superior of the "superman"; the state affirming its will, its unrivalled and uncontradicted demands, from which there should be no appeal and beyond which no right. The affirmation of German superiority is a natural and logical result of the doctrine of evolution without God—materialistic evolution. 'Fixing on this their gaze, the whole teaching force of this empire proceeded to work out and to teach its philosophy through all its educative agencies, until, after the lapse of years, it came to be the fixed belief of their intellectuals, their civil leaders and their military men. Might being declared to be the only right, and might only and always Materialism in one or another form, from this they reasoned that they had before them the duty and the destiny of subjugating the world. Their scheme of thought has governed their education, has made their theory

of the Nation; their theory has ultimated in their policy and conduct, and ignoring all that the rest of the world holds as the true theory and right action of men and nations, they have undertaken to conquer the world, which they despise as inferior in its evolution, to themselves. They are absolutely true to the doctrine of evolution as they hold it, having no God over all and no spiritual nature in man. And this is called a "scientific" view, that being a momentous word with which to conjure confidence.

Asserting it, gave them an assumed leadership in education. Their imitators were found in many lands, their propagandists everywhere. Their idea of themselves they wished us all to entertain, and an idea of ourselves which subordinated us to them. Mr. Poultney Bigelow, who I believe, was in the University with the Kaiser, well says: "The great German propaganda is more than twenty years old and was part of a general scheme to prepare the United States for the war in which we are now engaged. Not only the Imperial Staff of the German army acted as a central bureau of information on all things American; but the schools, the universities and societies for the propagation of Deutschthum and Deutsche Kultur were steered by military officials to prepare the American mind for a bene-

ficent German Empire in which a Germanised America would be one of the many provinces bowing down to a Germanised Augustus Cæsar."

"Every American School, university or scientific institution was feeling the spell of this propaganda without knowing its source. American colleges were commencing to feel that there was little worth learning in France or England—that the goal of academic ambition was a Berlin or Leipzig Ph. D. degree. The arrogance of all Prussian professors at our seats of learning was mistaken by us for the assertiveness of great masters and we little dreamed that these poisonous Pundits thought more of a Fourth Class Red Ribbon in Berlin than of the goodwill of their colleagues of Harvard or Ann Arbor. And then the Exchange Professors and the visits of Prince Henry, and the Germanic Museum for Harvard, and the statue of Frederic the Great for Washington and the persistent and nauseating celebration where glasses were raised to the "traditional friendship" of the two countries—and all the while the great general staff of Berlin was feverishly at work preparing plans for an invasion of America on the Belgian-Roumanian plan." With Mr. Bigelow agree the best informed students of affairs everywhere.

Plainly stated their purpose is the mastery,

enslavement and robbery of all nations. This purpose is now resisted by all but their present dupes and slaves, and the principles which they profess are equally repudiated. If we were once blindly drifting into their way of thinking, we now renounce it. Their philosophy is no longer philosophy, their science is no longer science to us. Both are Prussianism at its worst. In every realm we have partially conceded to them the primacy which they have claimed. Now we see their falseness and our folly. Their high priests of science falsely so called, have not the first quality of a scientific mind, namely, truthfulness—the love of truth. In the first year of the war nearly one hundred of the most distinguished of them drew up and signed a declaration addressed "to the civilised world" in which among other statements, these are given prominence: "It is not true that Germany is guilty of having caused this war. It is not true that the life and property of a single Belgian citizen was injured by our soldiers without the bitterest self-defence having made it necessary. It is not true that our troops treated Louvain brutally. It is not true that our warfare pays no respect to international laws." A distinguished American specialist in physical science truthfully says, "In these false declarations by German scientists whose names, many

of them, are household words—declarations which have never been withdrawn, German science has met the greatest downfall in her history." Yet these are the leaders, the masters who have been sought, lauded and blindly followed for two generations as having the right, because they claimed it, to reconstruct human ideals and thought on the basis of their scientific dixit. We are ashamed of our fatuous folly. These immoral, inhuman slaves of their Prussian masters have been sought unto to teach us science, theology, sociology. What are academic degrees worth, given by such critics and professors? They have sown the wind; we are now reaping the whirlwind. Their materialism is bringing forth its expected and legitimate fruit. Their national goal is consistent with their characters and word. *They* may be willing to be slaves to Prussia. *We* are not. Their national aims may be consistent with their theory though without a shred of morality or humanity. One such nation wrought out on their materialistic plan is one too many. We repudiate their theory. We are shamed by our own act in having followed them. We abandon materialism as an aim for our own or any other nation. And I hope we are penitent for the misery which we have caused by foolishly following such pretenders.

II

Wealth as an Object of Worship, is Dethroned

It had been allowed to usurp the throne of God. Of this peril we had been warned ages ago. The great Saviour of the world lived and wrought in an age when sculptured and painted idols were everywhere and mythologies about these were religion. Of any one of these idols of wood and stone He never spoke; concerning them He uttered no warning. There was but one idol to whom He alluded as disputing with the one true and living God the homage of men. It was Mammon. And Mammon had never been painted or sculptured. It was merely a name, used three times in the New Testament, for wealth as an object of worship. Christ knew that long after all worship of stones was abandoned, wealth would dispute with the true God the devotion of men.

Our age illustrated the fact. Money, or wealth has been the measure and gauge of success. He who gained it was the envied and successful man. Gradations of society have been fixed by it. The upper class has been the rich: the lower class the poor. Pride, show, splendour, extravagance, have

been the touchstone of coveted life. Moral and spiritual standards have been subordinated to gain. The market was esteemed more than the martyr. Lying to gain financial advantage was accounted venial. Education was bent to money-making vocations. At length the naked wickedness of Mammon worship became clear, as the German-Austrian-Turkish robbers began to assault and plunder the world. When empires lie, break treaties and steal, the magnitude of the disaster frightens us. The lust of wealth in this so-called cultured age then takes on a fury if ever equalled, certainly never surpassed. Wealth was so lordly and so mighty that we had been told that there could never be a general European war, that the bankers of Europe would not permit it; their money power would be the final arbiter. When the actual crisis came they had no more power than children armed with reeds, pushing back the avalanche. Mammon attacked, was afraid. It could not protect itself nor the world which had worshipped it. In dire extremity, it called for help; called on patriotism to come to the rescue. But even patriotism was enfeebled by subordination to wealth, lying with its head in Mammon's lap, like Samson in Delilah's. At length patriotism slowly broke from deadly alliance and called on honor, liberty,

humanity, morality, to come to the rescue and save wealth and country. And these powers, not material but spiritual, not the creatures nor the worshippers of wealth but the offspring of the living God, leaped up and entered the fray. Hindered so long but ever persistent, they alone could defend Mammon which they always regarded as a slave. Like Dagon before the ark of the Lord, Mammon grovelled and begged. Its prestige and its power were gone. It could not help itself, much less defend others. Then we saw and confessed that we had a primary duty to One higher than money; that the things of the spirit were most worth saving, that for them we might wisely spend all our wealth. And at the call of patriotism, honor, morality, liberty, and humanity, we began to pour forth the accumulated and stored treasures of years. They became a sacrifice on the altar of eternal spiritual good. By spiritual energy, motive and intelligence they made wealth a powerful defensive agency.

How better can this great fact be shown than by the motive and the act which gave fifty million dollars to the work of the Young Men's Christian Association? The gift was asked to make great and noble the souls of our soldiery. Early in the war the cry came that the first thing in the making of a first-rate soldier was the spirit

of him. The French called it the "morale," best paraphrased as "a state of mind." It meant everything which operates in the inner and spiritual life of the men; sympathy, duty, care, purity, cheer, faith, fealty, spirituality, loyalty to the unseen and the Eternal. From the spiritual energy and wisdom which saw and urged the need, came the outpouring of our gold, now doing its worthiest service. And now we know that wealth is a good servant and can ever be such; a servant of man, of the man with a soul, and with a duty to God and to his fellows, but never more enthroned as master of souls. Money is the servant of God and the servant of men. It should cease from now on to be the boast, the hope, the goal of life and be only its servant. We are laying it on the altar of God and humanity. It shall never dispute His throne.

III

God is Enthroned as the Essential Head of Government

The recent past has seen the rise of numerous speculative theories of human life and society. With differing labels they have had a general likeness, and without practical tests, have gained credence. Because new, they have been assumed

to be true, if indeed they can be said to be as original as they are vague and novel. Private morals and public duties have been thrown into confusion. Most of these theories have had this in common, that they were atheistic efforts to do without God and to be substitutes for religion and morals. Two of these may stand for the rest, Anarchism and Socialism.

In practical application Anarchism is adverse to all governments and all government. It objects to all morals and moral laws, protests against restraint, opposes rule and rulers, and is not only oblivious of God but rages against Him. Not definable in few words, it rejects almost all institutions and the principles on which they are founded; calls all morality "slave morality," and assumes that each individual is the only authoritative ruler. Within a few weeks a woman now in a United States prison, holding all these ideas in a most outspoken form, has assembled an audience of three thousand in New York, and held them for three hours in enthusiastic approval of her words, while she has denounced practically all individual, social and legal restraints. That audience, composed largely of people recently come to this country, is representative of great numbers in this and other lands who indorse these crazy dreams. They systemat-

ically teach to young children all these subversive ideas, and practise, defiantly, their teachings. One prominent among them, once a Christian minister, in a widely circulated volume, strenuously objects to the idea of God as Father, declaring that we neither need nor want a father God, nor any kind of relation which suggests subordination and dependence.

Socialism in its most strenuous forms, as in the German Social Democracy, is an association of people, found in many countries, which is difficult to briefly define and characterise: difficult to define because there is no authoritative representative whose definitions are standard; and not easy to describe because there are many varying stages of the thought, which do not agree one with another. Allowing for these variations, we may take the mass of the Social Democrats in Germany and their sympathisers in Russia for illustration. All are atheistic, selfish, intolerant, violent against wealth and equally against work, whose purpose is to dispossess those who have any accumulated property, or any control of machinery, business and goods, and to rearrange the whole direction and ownership of the same. The Bolsheviki represent a sufficiently large number of these to illustrate what they may do if they gain control in any land. The product

of these theories is in sight. It is Chaos. Russia is illustrating it. Here is a headless nation, because it is without control, without law, without government, and pervaded with a reckless sense of irresponsibility to any power, human or divine.

Stability in a community, a state, a nation, must rest on a foundation of laws; these on an underlying foundation of principles, and these must express reverence for duties and rights, and goodwill for one's neighbours. The deepest principle is a sense of Right and this has been placed in the constitution of things by the Creator. Out of Right as conceived and affirmed by God, come rights, duties, authority, government, order, harmony and prosperity. By these are upheld honour and liberty, in their only true and reasonable definitions and sanctions. On anarchy you cannot predicate order. Its outcome is chaos, confusion.

In a godless society, right, authority and government are impossible. These must be founded on God and derived from Him. And He from whom these are derived and by whom sanctioned, is and must be much more than a Being of might, authorising any and all actions which one can assert the power and the will to do. Sanctioning virtue He must possess it. If He were without holiness, or righteousness, mercy or love, He

could neither direct nor demand these. The basis of society is not any conception of God which a heathen or a Prussian may conceive to best correspond to his ambitions, but the one and only God, the God of universal man, of universal right and of universal law. Human goodwill must find its sanction in Divine goodwill and the spring of goodwill in man or God, is and must be love. Out of this attribute comes and becomes all benevolent feeling and beneficent law. As we know God, the ultimate statute of His kingdom is the command to men to love Him and to love one another. Unless He is lovable in His character, no one by being commanded, could be compelled to love Him. A god of mere Might or a man in whom Might is all, does not suggest love or show love nor show the least possibility of evoking it. A nation to which Might is supreme, cannot know love and cannot be loved. Unless there is the sanction of the heart to the principles, purposes and motives of government, it cannot hold and direct the race. And laws arbitrarily forced upon men by a characterless being, must issue in characterless society.

The God who being enthroned, assures social order (including civil) must be the God who is revealed as Power and Love with all that these imply. And there is but One who has ever been

revealed to men who has this character. He is the living God whom Jesus Christ especially has made known to us. And so Christ, revealing Him, becomes "the chief corner-stone" of the world order, and love becomes its vital and universal principle. Any other view of man and society leaves the individual selfish, greedy, cruel and detached. At the same time it disintegrates society, condemns law, causing repulsion instead of attraction, confusion instead of order. It is not possible to have society, the social order among men, without bringing them to reverence and obey the God whose law is wisdom and love. To make order possible, to save the state, to create society, to establish law we enthrone God.

The Prelude to the Constitution of the United States reads: "We, the People of the United States, in order to secure a more perfect union, to establish Justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, and to secure the blessings of Liberty for ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish the following Constitution." "Order," "Union," "Tranquillity," "Defence," hold beneficent meanings only when limited and defined by the Law of God. Reverence for Constitutions must be assured through reverence for God.

IV

Transcendent Spiritual Necessities Demand and Justify Physical Sacrifices

Having wisely and rationally apprehended that spiritual good and attributes are of the highest worth to us, we are readily and eagerly giving and exchanging for their maintenance all physical possessions, and even life itself. If we have repudiated materialism as a theory of human life and advantage, and accepted spiritual treasures instead, we are proving our practical faith by offering all we possess to uphold our good confession. Unlimited material sacrifices are being poured out by which to maintain, conserve and promote our spiritual possessions. Not mere passive assent do we give to the proposition that spiritual good is worth more than material, but we actively offer all we have in proof. Of our surrender of wealth and goods we have already spoken. A vastly greater gift asserts a much deeper faith. It is the gift of life and suffering.

Of this supreme, personal sacrifice an immortal example is found in the martyrdom of Edith Cavell. Serving the cause of humanity and right, she refused to count her life dear unto

her at the dictate of brutal might. With her beautiful life on the one hand and the grave on the other, life to be preserved by inhumanity on her part, and death to be visited upon her for benevolence, she chose the immortal good. And she deserves immortal fame. Yet she is only one of her sex of whom uncounted thousands have the same estimate of the duties and values of life. Our gold is dross compared with such offerings of flesh for spirit.

As this and these are personal sacrifices, so on a national scale, we have seen the devotion of the nation of Belgium to honour and truth. The choice was deliberate. History can never describe the grandeur of that choice. There was the offer of protection and material advantage without limit, at the hands of the German tempter. The alternative, undisguised, was devastation and death. It was a clear choice between physical riches and spiritual wealth. And there was no hesitation; no uncertainty, no debate. Belgium offered all. Her rulers, her men, women and children surrendered every visible and estimable treasure so that she might keep an unsullied soul; so that the honour, truth, duty of the nation might shine as the stars forever. Wonder seizes us whenever we reflect on the exaltation of motive, and the sacrificial exchange

which Belgium made of the things which are seen and temporal for the things which are not seen and eternal.

As Belgium illustrates this spirit of sacrifice on a national scale, no less have the allies done likewise in the International policy which they have adopted. Their choice has been of the same nature. Their governments have staked all on the greater value of spiritual character and qualities. All that can add glory and pleasure to the outer things of a transient world they have offered up so as to gain and own forever the spirit, and the deserved reputation of honesty and integrity of life. Their whole populations, of one and another country, have vied with each other in proving their loyalty to morality, humanity, integrity and liberty. For Right, moral, humane, God-revealed and God-sanctioned Right, we offer, and if need be, will give up all our physical possessions.

Such sacrifice is not only made but gladly and quickly made, as we are moved by spiritual impulses and guided by reason. For the law of sacrifice is a wholly reasonable law. Seeing that all things have value, and that some things have a much greater value than others, we compare and measure these things and choose that which has the greater worth. For this we give the

lesser. The exchange is made; we are enriched; and the act of sacrifice passes into the records of wisdom and goodness. Thus we estimate the things of the spirit, and we estimate the things of the flesh. The latter are very precious; the former are much more so. We choose the things which we are sure are worthiest and most precious. And it is the consciousness of doing this which exalts our seeming losses to immortal gains.

How significant is this exchange when we consider that now, for the things of the spirit, human life, by countless lives are being given. This very fact assures us of the immortality of our personality. If the spiritual attributes of the man are worthy of defence through giving up our material goods, much more the spiritual personality which these attributes express and adorn, is undying. We cannot rationally hold to the theory of a merely mortal life, ended at the grave, and then give it for so-called spiritual good. If this life is all, if there is no more life after it, then it is all and the best I have. Indeed it is so valuable that nothing can be measured against it. When it is gone, all is gone, and as for me, I am gone. Were that the fact, then I would not on any account or for any cause, surrender my life. Not anything nor everything else could be weighed

or measured against it to warrant the exchange. If I give all for nothing I am a fool. But we all wisely postulate immortal life. After this life, there is more life for us. We end our career on earth, but we go on beyond. Only the certainty of this makes reasonable our offering of life.

And so in this great day, taking inventory of our greatest treasures, we have come to have a clear view of our spirit and its immortal future. This estimate is what Jesus Christ made—He who brought life and immortality to light. He made the sacrifice of all material things to be the attestation of the greater value of the spiritual things which remained, and He gave His life because eternal life is better and because He had more life than can ever be subject to death. The war is, on the German side, the battle of materialism, of might. Necessarily it must be stated in physical terms. Their war is immoral, unrighteous, unholy, unmerciful, inhuman, without honour and with plunder and merely material gain for its purpose. By their purpose our spiritual heritage is assailed. Against their design we array all our spiritual forces which carry with them all our physical possessions, so that Right may rule, that eternal Right may govern the souls and the lives of men and nations, and the essen-

tials which are eternal may remain our immortal possessions.

▼

Through World-wide Co-operation We Are Coming to World Fraternity

With our allies we are working unitedly and drawing closer in a co-operation which is at once a fellowship of suffering and of mutual love and help. Hitherto we have not realised that we are really near neighbours to them. Fraternity has been more spoken of than felt. But now all indifference has been dissipated and our former isolation has ceased to exist. We could no longer withhold from them our sympathy or our service. Joining with them, we resist tyranny and contend against a common foe. Uniting with them in merciful service, our sympathies as well as our courage unify us.

How could real fraternity be more assured than by the friendly aid of which the Red Cross Society is the most conspicuous example? Is there any kind of need which we are not eagerly seeking through it to alleviate? Its emblem, the Cross, is the sign of reconciliation of two worlds, heaven and earth; and of two continents and all peoples. Others suffer. That is all we need to know. And we hasten to them, bearing in our

hands and in our hearts whatever will alleviate their distress.

Of kindred character and influence is our policy of "Food Conservation" by which, with self-denial, self-control and self-sacrifice, we build up the strength of others. Even to this day, as many times in years past, when we move against the sale and use of alcoholic beverages, some men remonstrate with us and ask, "Are you daring to invade our liberties and to tell us what we shall drink? By and by, you will tell us what to eat." Quite true. Our government is now welcome at our homes and tables as it comes in and tells us what to eat. For it not only advises and urges us what to eat but prescribes what we shall not eat. Four years ago we should have jeered at the possibility of such a course. Now we know that our very life as a nation depends on our compliance. And even more marvellous is the fact that we are doing this so that what we save shall be sent across the sea to feed and strengthen millions whom we never saw and never will know. Our most private and personal use of food is being governed in the interest of the whole world. And we are glad to have it so. "Deny yourself" is as truly a government order as it is a command of Christ. It is the only rule by which the nations are to be saved.

The Salvation Army, in its extreme poverty, used to advertise, "Self-Denial Week." We were wont to smile at their ardour and to count it fanaticism. Its purpose was good, but in their poverty and manifest need, we wondered why or how they could exercise self-denial. Now, we who then smiled are doing as they did to save our lives by saving others. It has been told that when our soldiers first went to France, they were greeted as "The Salvation Army." Such they were and are. We are all marching with them. They and we and all who deny themselves for others, are the Salvation Army of the World.

And how remarkable that we are becoming clearly aware that salvation comes through self-denial, and wisest self-direction. No man is living to himself if he is living usefully or rationally. We now regulate our desires and our actions by God's commands and by the needs of others, as the national government makes them known to us. Our interest affiliated with our allies make our evident obligations. Selfish purposes are shamed and fought. Profiteering is forbidden by law; that is, taking selfish advantage in the commercial world of the necessities of others and enriching ourselves at their expense. From a new angle we see that waste and wickedness are inseparable from the liquor traffic. We protest on the

broadest grounds against foodstuffs being used to make ruinous and poisonous drinks. There is something to be done with grains which must take precedence of any selfish use of them. Our care for our human brothers is being emphasised. On it depends our own welfare, inseparable from theirs. We are brothers in spirit and action. We suffer and serve in love for one another. And so we come to live as men must who live well. The love for our neighbour is the goal of our highest victory, the motive and result of self-mastery.

VI

The Christian Doctrine of Human World Unity Is Vindicated

The word Christian I use unhesitatingly because all the gains and aims which I have named are Christian, and expressions of Christian principles and teaching. Essentially spiritual, Christian truth must repudiate mere Materialism and put in its place the truths of a spiritual world. Likewise Christianity dethrones Mammon and makes wealth the servant of higher things. It enthrones God and finds in Him the source of the laws of life and human order. One of its central doctrines is that of Self-sacrifice for the good of others. And it leads the world in

announcing and cultivating the spirit of Brotherhood in and among men. So likewise it assumes and teaches the Unity and equality of men of every race and clime as subjects of Divine mercy and care.

In theory and practise this teaching has been always contested by mankind. Men of one nation or tribe have considered themselves superior to their fellow men of other locations and characteristics and have usually held a hostile rather than a friendly relation to the stranger.

Assuming human unity Christ directed a universal propaganda of teaching and evangelising among all men. The four universals of His final commission to His disciples are thus given in the Bible: "*All* authority hath been given me in heaven and on earth. Go ye therefore, and make disciples of *all* nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit; teaching them to observe *all* things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you *all* the days, even unto the end of the world."

This is an announcement of a universal, a world religion, having a universal application to all men, assuming and teaching the unity of law, of morals, of truth, of humanity, of kindness and help everywhere.

So, obedient to this broad direction, the fol-

lowers of Christ in every age have gone into all lands and among all peoples vindicating world unity, a common humanity and a universal duty of man to God and of man to man. Extensive and inclusive as this conception is, it has by many been opposed, traduced, belittled and scorned. Without hesitation, those who understood their Lord have persisted in their glorious enterprise. By their doctrine of God and their love of humanity they have profoundly impressed the mind of the, as yet, unchristian world. And so well have they represented and taught the doctrine of Christ that, at this time, among other world-wide benefits which they admittedly have conferred, is that they have visibly given to the leaders of every land of the Orient a lofty conception of the Christian spirit and purpose.

Naturally the preponderating millions of Asia might have assumed that all the peoples of the West from whence these missionaries came, were Christian. But they have learned to discriminate. And now when nations of the western world who might have been expected to be Christians, have assailed the rest of mankind in ways so selfish and so wicked as to shock even a savage mind, all these oriental nations understand that such assailants are not Christians. They also understand that the defenders of the best things

in human life, because they so defend, are not to be classed with their assailants, and that on the side of Germany are the foes of humanity as on the side of the allies are its friends. The Asiatic nations therefore are the friends of the allies. And while by the vastness of their numbers they might, if hostile, overwhelm the western world, they are now its friends, ready to police the world and to preserve and defend the things which the missionaries have taught them are the best and most sacred for universal man.

We owe it to-day to the work of the Christian missionaries teaching the nature of God as Father and the privilege of man as brothers, that the sympathies and alliances of the Asiatic and even the African world are with the allies.

The grounds on which Germany seeks to subjugate and tyrannise over the human race are totally unchristian. Assuming with unspeakable conceit that they are superior to all the rest of mankind and that they shall be masters while all the rest are their slaves, they have not only awakened Europe and America to resist them but have shown to the far East as well, their presumption, their savagery and their unfitness to rule.

It remains for the nations of the West to see their duty to hereafter send their best representatives to the East to give to them our very best

treasures, training and culture. Last year, by dint of great self-denial, the Christians of the North American Continent spent twenty million dollars, most freely given, to carry the best of their possessions, the truth of the Gospel, to far lands. Last year the smokers of tobacco in the United States spent more than a thousand millions for smoke, fifty times as much as the Churches could send to teach and care for the heathen world. Suppose that a spirit of self-denial had come over those who waste this vast sum and suppose that it were diverted to giving our very best people and the best truth, undoubtedly the truth of Christianity, to the world: What relation would that have to the consolidation, prosperity, and peace of mankind? And suppose even that our Government as a matter of economy, so as to save billions of American money and billions of value of goods, with millions of invaluable lives, should hereafter pursue the purpose of uplifting and unifying the world of mankind in a wholly kindly, brotherly, unselfish, philanthropic and Christian way. What more wonderful political economy could be launched and out of what could spring greater universal advantage?

Seriously and reverently let me say that the foregoing facts of life and reason made known to

the world and impressed on the minds of men, seem to me a rich compensation for our defensive war and a call far more impressive than the war cry of "Democracy," to furnish a reason and a means of bringing to us Victory. The form of government is of far less concern than its purpose and spirit—and that spirit with its form and fruitage, the love of God and love of man, reveal the prizes and victory now inciting us to battle.

VIII

Prohibition and National Defence*

THE British battle line is bent. Up to this time it is not broken. Suppose it should break, leaving nothing interposed between us and our foes. How unspeakable the peril to us and to the world. The very contemplation of it fills us with anxiety and dread. So also the allied battle line is strained through all the many miles where British, Belgians, Italians, French, Americans, are withstanding the foe; they have been pushed back from thirty to fifty miles. Suppose that strain should end in disintegration and defeat. Imagine that war weariness or lack of courage should seize and possess that mighty defensive host, so that they should cease to struggle. The door would be wide open for the inpour of the fierce and cruel German power upon civilisation and the whole world.

Can we imagine a more terrifying peril, a direr catastrophe? And yet a greater foe than the Central Powers has already broken through

*Delivered April 27, to 2,000 people representing 14 churches, in Meriden, Conn.

upon the civilised nations of the world and is working upon them greater disaster than the Central Powers could possibly work. Two of the greatest allied statesmen, both British, have within a short time spoken of this greater foe and greater peril. Mr. Lloyd George, the brilliant Premier of Great Britain, has told us that there is more to be feared from the alcoholic liquor habit in Great Britain than from all its German foes, and with enthusiasm born of the spirit of wisdom, prophecy and warning, he has striven to arouse his countrymen to this dire and deadly peril.

In 1880 the unsurpassed modern English statesman, William E. Gladstone, quoted with approbation the statement that the liquor traffic and drinking habit had wrought more ruin in this world than war, pestilence and famine combined. To this statement of historic fact, the brilliant British statesman, with his broad outlook, gave unhesitating assent.

With such testimony, and this is but representative, need I have any hesitation in saying that a greater peril confronts the allies now and the world at large, from the dominant liquor traffic than from all the exertions of the hosts of barbarism in Central Europe? It is not as if I were quoting these two statesmen alone; the

greatest soldiers and publicists, the greatest economists and observers of the world agree with their opinion. Among military and naval contemporaries Lord Roberts, General French, General Joffre, Admiral Fisher, Admiral Jellicoe, Admiral Beattie, Lord Woolsey, and numerous others of equal rank give their accordant voice as to this greater peril.

Some unthinking souls have tried to lay upon the Lord God the responsibility of this present war, denying to Him either goodness or care of mankind in that He has permitted this desolating scourge to fall upon the world. But no one has the audacity to charge upon God the killed, wounded, and missing, the destruction, desolation and overthrow of the liquor traffic. We know too well that it is of our making, through our consenting, by our protection that this scourge prevails, and even human unbelief and irreverent audacity, dare not attempt to lay off the responsibility from us who should take it, from us who are guilty of creating the present condition.

It is impossible to sum up the harm that alcohol does in the nation or the nations. It is impossible, on the other hand, to tell what advantage is open and derivable from the destruction of the use of alcoholic spirits as a beverage, and, in fact, in any form. My present purpose in the

face of the perils of this great war, is to show that parallel with it and of greater magnitude, is another strife into which we should enter with the utmost valour and urgency, a strife co-ordinate with the assault of the Central Powers, more destructive in all the ways in which that is destructive, and an immediate and threatening ally of all the evils which they propose, and which lies quite within the realm of our own responsibility.

In undertaking to show how, as Lloyd George has said, the liquor traffic reinforces the evil forces of the present war, I shall excuse myself from a multiplication of figures and statistics. For every fact which I allege I have the most copious proof and if any of you really desire to get the exact facts, the precise data, which will substantiate all that I shall say, you will find them condensed in a little book entitled: "Encyclopedia of Temperance, Prohibition, and Public Morals," issued by The Methodist Book Concern, 150 Fifth Avenue, New York. This is a compend of multitudinous sources of verifiable information and fact, demonstrating the immediate and dire perils which have been put upon us by the use of alcoholic drink.

The factors of national defence which I have in mind when I speak of "Prohibition and Na-

tional Defence," are really twofold: things material, by which we can defend ourselves, and man power; and while these are not separable entirely, for the purposes of analysis they will assist us in the contemplation of this great double danger of war and drink. They are so related that they must be discussed together.

First, therefore, I call your attention to the relation of the liquor traffic to the destruction of those material agencies which are absolutely necessary to the winning of this war. We already have pretty clearly before our mind that food will win the war. It has become a watchword of our time. Never until within the last two years have we dreamed of lacking adequate foodstuffs in this country or in the world. The scarcity which we have felt is even now upon us in a most critical way. We are told at this very moment that there is great peril of our losing the strength necessary to carry on the war for lack of sufficient bread for our armies and for those of our allies. The scarcity of food, which now we feel and which we felt last year, we are likely to experience more rather than less. That scarcity may be said to arise in a general way from non-production and waste.

There are various reasons why there is not an adequate production of foodstuffs, but one of

those incontrovertible reasons which I will allege is this: There are a multitude of non-producers who might raise food supplies and who do not. Many of these are idlers, and idlers on account of vicious habits induced by alcoholic liquor. In the State of Minnesota a few years ago, when the wheat was spoiling in the fields, an earnest effort was made to get the idlers in the cities to go forth to the farms at a large wage—three and a half to four dollars a day and board—and work to save the crops at the harvest time. Practically, they nearly all declined. It is inconceivable that anything should have so borne them down with reckless carelessness and idleness excepting that they were under the influence of an unnatural appetite for strong drink.

At this present time, this fact is conceded by the attitude of the states of New Jersey, West Virginia, and New York, and also by the nation, where the effort is being made to compel all idlers to assist in production. Those who are unwilling to work are to be compelled to work, if that is possible, and the greatest difficulty, as well as the greatest number of non-workers, will be found to confront us when we deal with those who are altogether too willing to use their powers and their time in alcoholic dissipation.

Not only are foodstuffs wanting through non-

production, but vast stores of grain are destroyed directly to make liquors. In those liquors, whatever their name, there is almost no food value whatever. All statements to the contrary are simply untrue. The amount of grain made into alcoholic liquor and so diverted from the channels of nutrition, is almost too great to conceive. Various figures of a colossal character are produced both in this country and Great Britain to show how much has been destroyed. We reckon the wasted grains by the hundred thousands and the millions of tons. The sugar and molasses, also, which are very important as foods, in almost untold quantities, have been made use of for the manufacture of liquor.

It has been openly alleged that three hundred millions of days' support for individual soldiers might have been conserved by saving what has been destroyed in the United States alone in a single year. But without attempting to limit or measure the quantity, we know, and the whole world agrees, that it is so vast that the preservation of these foodstuffs for food purposes instead of their manufacture into liquor might make the difference between famine and plenty. When you recognise that this waste is so great in quantity and so grievous in quality, it would seem as though no one ought to complain of lack

of food who is not fighting with all his might to preserve what we have.

In connection with food as a material necessity for the winning of the war, our attention has been called to the great necessities in the fuel line only lately obvious; during the last year many of us shivered with the cold, and anxiously feared for those who could not get fuel. Families suffered, little children died, business places were closed at vast expense, schools were shut up, churches discontinued their services, railroads diminished the number of their trains, ocean transportation was balked, victory imperilled on account of lack of fuel.

When you come to inquire why this was and is likely to be so, you find that a very considerable proportion of this lack of fuel came from inadequate mining. That is to say, the miners failed to produce in proportion to their power, and so the public was deprived of necessary fuel. The Coal, Fuel and Iron Company tell us, as do many other mining organisations, that just as soon as the liquor traffic by any means is temporarily stopped in the vicinity of their mines, production is vastly increased.

In the State of Pennsylvania, a member of the Pittsburgh Coal Producers' Association declared before the Interstate Commerce Commission that

if the government would eliminate the liquor business from the coal producing districts of Pennsylvania, Ohio and Illinois, the output of coal would be increased twenty-five million tons. That was at the height of the famine last winter. Most distinguished experts in the anthracite region of Pennsylvania have told us that a third of the output of coal was lost on account of the drinking habits of the miners, and have besought the government of the United States to take drastic measures to abolish the saloon in that region. The same has been true in Illinois and in nearly all the other coal producing states. This is the outspoken judgment of most coal producers lately given.

The coal shortage in Illinois was reported last winter to be about 500,000 tons, but a statistician figured that the amount of coal consumed in the manufacture and sale of the beer alone used in Chicago was more than 500,000 tons. The liquor business in Chicago alone created the deficit in the coal supply of Illinois.

This, however, is only one aspect of the loss and wastage of the fuel necessary for winning this war. The breweries consume a vast amount of coal. Outside of war industries only two exceed breweries in quantity of coal used. During the season when churches and schools were closed

and business was crippled, all the breweries were wide open, and the distributing centers, the saloons, owned so largely by the breweries, were no less warm and full, as I may say.

In the accessories of the brewing business, that is, in the manufacturing of boxes, barrels, bottles and other things connected with the traffic, in the transportation of raw material, manufactured product, barrels, bottles, coal by the railroads, for the liquor business—there were needed not less than two and one-half million tons of coal. This added to the seven and one-half million tons used by the breweries last year, would make ten million of the fifty millions shortage; and if to that be added the twenty-five million tons wasted through lack of careful mining, thirty-five millions of tons has been accounted for already; and it is easy to account for the rest.

For the transportation of liquors in this country last year, two hundred thousand cars were required at a time when we could not get transportation for foodstuffs. At a time when every interest of the country suffered for lack of adequate railroad facilities, the breweries and distilleries were demanding and getting two hundred thousand cars for transporting the liquor which they made.

There was a great shortage of coal, as you

remember, for the transport service. Very many ships in the harbour of New York, to say nothing of other harbours, loaded with provisions for the allies, which they sorely needed, were prevented from sailing because of lack of adequate coal. But the breweries had coal, the saloons had coal, though the railroads and transports had not. While our allies were bravely fighting for us, defending our interests with their lives, they were denied both food and fuel, while we provided millions of tons of both for the manufacture of alcoholic drink.

It is perfectly well known that manufactures of an essential and valuable sort are very greatly diminished by the use of alcoholic drink. By this I mean that the output of factories is greatly decreased, that the reduced capacity of drinking and half-drunken operatives greatly diminishes that output, and that whenever there is a release, however temporary, from the baleful effect of the saloon on a community of workmen, the manufacturing interests greatly multiply their production. Most of the great concerns of this country bear witness to the fact that there would be a plenty of manufactured goods for all legitimate purposes, provided the workmen were prevented from diminishing their powers through the use of alcoholic liquor.

We know that in this war iron and steel play a very large part. Nearly all the iron and steel mills of this country forbid the use of alcohol to their men for numerous reasons. In the first place, it saves a vast amount of material otherwise wasted. It prevents a great array of accidents of a most costly character. It increases output to a very high degree. So that the manufacturing interests of iron and steel are invariably, in this country, the antagonists of the liquor traffic. The same is true in regard to munitions. Great Britain had the experience of seeing a wholly inadequate supply of munitions because the workmen declined to work more than three or four days in a week. Nor could they be stimulated or stirred by the perils of defeat, or by the ardours of their statesmen so long as they were under this sinister influence. They would rather be drunk and slaves, than to be freemen and produce what was necessary to accomplish and perpetuate their freedom.

In the matter of manufacture of cars and ships, which from the very first had been one of our chief necessities in winning this war, the habit of alcoholisation on the part of the workmen has stood in the way of an adequate output. Ships in Great Britain, we have been told repeatedly, have been held up because the work-

men would drink and would not work. Repairs on the fleet and on the merchant service have been hindered, construction has been put back, and again and again the sailings of the ships have been interfered with when troops were on board, because of drunken engineers or stokers, who were incapable of realising the peril in which they were placing their country. Transportation has been blocked by land and by sea directly and indirectly, between America and Great Britain, between Great Britain and France, and from all the ports on which the allies have relied, by reason of the liquor traffic.

How could any enemy wish more in the way of obstruction to the essential necessities of our armies and navies than has been furnished by the liquor traffic thus made manifest in the hands and under the control of the liquor power?

I have thus too briefly discoursed of the material powers which are withdrawn from our service in the war where they are absolutely needed, for the sake of maintaining the liquor traffic.

Let me pass now to speak of the man power, by which, of course, I include all the human power which is necessary for the winning of this war, and show how that man power is diminished in all its main essentials by the per-

petuation of the liquor traffic. The amount of testimony is so vast that I can only touch upon it here and there, but these allusions are capable of the fullest substantiation.

In the first place, we are wont to say that the better the health of the soldier and of those who stand behind him, the greater likelihood there is of his achieving the purposes of successful warfare. In other words, muscular power and good health have much to do with a fine soldiery, and a fine citizenship. We have gloried in the fact that many of our young men who have volunteered or entered the army by selective draft, have been enormously improved in health and bearing, in vigour and in life, by the training to which they have been subjected. Are we equally and distinctly aware that muscular power of the sort necessary for soldier and citizen alike, is destroyed effectually by the use of alcoholic drink? If you take the work of a soldier, you find much of it of a distinctly athletic sort; but now for many years in the whole realm of athletics we have known that liquor is the foe of athletic power. No athlete is addicted to drink; no boxer, no baseball player, no football player of any distinction, no competitive oarsman, no champion at tennis or golf can be found who will for a moment sanction the use of alcoholic drink

on the part of those who expect to achieve athletic superiority and honours.

We have had experience for years, sanctioned by the great soldiers of Europe and America that marching is done best and most advantageously by total abstainers. They have the greatest endurance, and can effect the greatest accomplishments. When it comes to the exercise of muscular power in the particular function of war, for instance in marksmanship, we know beyond all question that the use of alcoholic drink, whether in smaller or larger quantities, is highly damaging to correct and exact marksmanship. I am speaking now of this one particular thing, as illustrated, for instance, in precision, rapidity and endurance firing. In the Swedish army, out of a possible thirty shots, men who had taken no liquor whatsoever and were not accustomed to use it, made twenty-three hits. The same men after having used a small quantity of alcohol made only three hits out of a possible thirty. If it is desirable to have a powerful and reliable muscularity as the basis of successful soldiery, then it is absolutely necessary to banish alcohol from the soldier and sailor from the army and navy.

In the navy, as well as in the army, it used to be that rations of grog were given to the marines

and naval men at sea. No one would think of doing that now. All the fine marksmanship and endurance, the accuracy, the precision, the factors which make for the possibility of success in this war, are associated with total abstinence from the use of alcohol in any form.

I have spoken of muscular power, but everyone knows that muscular power depends greatly on nervous conditions, on the fineness and strength, the poise and balance of nerve. We know that the finer parts of our organisation, the nerves and the brain, are immediately affected by alcoholic liquor, and we know that alcoholic liquor is not a stimulant, nor has it ever been, but is a depressant. It destroys nervous poise; it does not increase it. The superstition that alcohol is a stimulant is as plainly superstitious as any idolatry of any heathen savage of any historic time in the history of the world. There is no power to make for a stronger manhood, whether in muscle or nerve, in alcoholic drink however taken or applied, whether less or more.

When it comes to the combination of nerve and muscle, the co-ordination of the fineness of human activity with the force and vigour of it, the same is markedly true. This will appear as I proceed.

We must know, too, that in our time with the

extraordinary weapons that are made use of both by land and by sea, and with the demands that are made upon a soldier's life (and the same of a civilian's life), mind power is as necessary for an army and for achievement in the direction of victory as muscular power. Because the brain is the agent of the mind, the vigour of the brain as an agency through which thought is operated, is of the utmost power in achieving victory. We are positively assured that mental efficiency is impaired very greatly by any degree of the use of alcoholic drink. Men who are accustomed to drink on Saturday and Sunday have been found on Monday to be diminished in mental vigour as much as twenty-eight and one half per cent., more than a quarter of their power having been lost. All the reactions of the sensibilities are operated on adversely by the use of liquor.

Quickness of vision and accuracy of vision, readiness of hearing, responsiveness of muscular action to the demands of the mind, are all impaired by the use of alcoholic drink. Errors in judgment, inaccuracies in sensation, defects of memory, incorrectness of observation, all these result, and the general lessening of the normal ability of men, even after the use of a little alcohol, often rises from ten to eighteen per cent.

Every soldier who has been at the front, every intelligent man or woman who knows what is demanded of a soldier, understands that the greater the mentality, the greater the self-reliance. The ability to take initiative, to think for one's self, to think quickly and to judge wisely, is a very large share of the power of a soldier in our time. Against all this, against everything that makes for an efficient soldier, alcohol is a deadly foe.

But we are getting a further and deeper vision of war at this time than we have ever had before. Although it has been known it has never been talked about so much as now, that the chief power of the soldier is his moral power; that the great power of a nation is its moral and spiritual power. To get the right spirit into men and into people is the foremost thing in assuring victory. Nothing is so to be relied upon as spiritual activity and spiritual strength.

The Germans have very little sense of this. We remember how they measured the force of England by the 250,000 of England's little army, and called that force "contemptible." They did not reckon with the English spirit, which measures its strength not only as against millions of men, but measures its strength by forces that are entirely uncount-

able and unweighable in terms of material force.

So we recognise the immense importance of moral power for the making of a soldier, an army, a nation or a victorious struggle. At the same time, we know that vice abounds as a result of alcoholic drink; that practically all kinds of vice are directly caused and increased by it; that commercialised sexual vice, which has worked such terrific havoc in the armies of the old world, is always associated with the degradation of woman and of man also, through drink. Observations in and about the saloons of all the great cities of the world testify to this. And nothing is more suggestive of the power, the glory and the victory of the American army than the frequent affirmation that, as to virtue over against vice, it is the most virtuous army that has ever been assembled. God grant that this may prove to be the fact; if it is a virtuous army, it will be an invincible army.

Moral power shows itself not only in the grasp that men have upon the purposes of this great conflict, but in their obedience to high intelligence and to the direction of their superiors. Equally evident is it that the sources of all lawlessness in this country and in every country, are found in connection with the liquor traffic and use. None

have done more to degrade the whole legal order of human society than have the brewers of the United States of America. They are always ready to violate the law. When it has been suggested, where prohibition has obtained, that possibly some of these great companies would assist to break down the law by furnishing illicit liquor importations, where they were otherwise forbidden, it has always been true—the proof is irrefutable—that no brewing company has hesitated to become a violator of the law.

They have in the presence of the United States courts within the last two years in western Pennsylvania, paid vast fines rather than have their wickedness brought to light, as they have sought to influence elections. And not only so, but nearly all the brewers of this country are pro-German. They not only have German names and German directors, but their breweries and their saloons are nests of treason. The products of their breweries and the profits thereof, which we have so foolishly been allowing them to make, have been poured into the coffers of Germany; and not a few of them have been found in direct affiliation with the enemies of their country. There is no patriotism in the liquor traffic, no patriotism among those who make it, or among those who sell it.

Saloons are the haunts of criminals. If policemen desire to find those who have done some especially infamous crimes, they always go to certain saloons where these people are found. Every kind of criminality, every degradation of moral power, is associated with the use of alcoholic drink. It lowers and degrades in every possible respect.

Now, this being true, if we are to win a great moral victory, if we are to overcome the evil forces of the world in the interests of the good, it is absolutely necessary that we break with the liquor traffic; that we separate ourselves from it, and separate ourselves also from its sinister and degrading influence in lowering the moral tone and stamina of our people.

When it comes to the fouler forms of vice, where vice merges into crime, the whole world knows that the greatest cause of crime in this country is the liquor traffic. When the convicts of the penitentiaries of our country, as they have repeatedly done, have petitioned that the saloons might be closed so that when they came out they might not be tempted, as they have been tempted before; when careful commissions have summed up the criminality of the country as nine-tenths of it originating in the use of alcoholic drink; when the foremost judges, including the Su-

preme Court of the United States, have declared that the alcoholic liquor traffic is inextricably mixed up with criminality, we certainly have proof enough to know that the liquor traffic can be counted on as the foe of everything that we seek to make victorious in this war, and destructive of every agency of achievement and triumph.

Demoralising as war is, war has never demoralised as the liquor traffic has; cruel as war is, it has never been so cruel as the liquor traffic; deadly and destructive as have been modern arms and agents of destruction, they have never killed, wounded and imprisoned anything like as many people as have been destroyed by the use of strong drink.

We have a very sad realisation that vast numbers of precious human lives are being sacrificed in this war, that in our defensive struggle, the noblest of our youth are offering themselves on the altars of liberty and honor and truth. But let us not forget that by the most careful observation, pursued through many years, it is perfectly clearly shown that the extension of human life is greatly diminished by even the moderate use of alcoholic drink. There are those who say two and one half, or three per cent. beer is not as destructive as forty or fifty per cent. whiskey or

rum; but the truth is, whether it is taken a little at a time or more at a time, the aggregate of alcohol taken by the drinkers of beer is likely to be fully as great, or greater, than that of the drinkers of whiskey, and to result as ruinously.

So, whether it be as moderate drinkers or drinkers of one sort or another of liquor, the proof is overwhelming that life is shortened anywhere from twenty-five to seventy-five per cent. by the use of alcohol as a beverage. Forty-three life insurance companies of the United States and Canada, examining more than 2,000,000 cases in the last few years, have brought their practically unanimous verdict into the high court of the world, showing that this is true.

Longevity is greatly diminished, the susceptibility to disease is largely increased by the use of alcoholic liquor, and I might instance, if I had time—as I certainly have information—unnumbered cases in which life is shortened by ten, twenty, thirty years, and productiveness accordingly, through the use of alcohol in any and every form. I could give you a list of pages on pages of the statements of the most eminent physicians of the world, showing the deleterious effect of alcohol upon life, upon young life, upon little childhood, through heredity, producing

defectives, dependents and delinquents; upon young children in their environment, where, through bad example and in the homes of drunkards, they are reduced to a minimum of efficiency and power; where through privation, their young lives are made so weak that the likelihood of their continuing to live is very greatly diminished.

Last year 20,000 physicians of the American Medical Association were represented in their convention in New York City. With scarcely a dissenting voice, all this host of highly intelligent men, who understand human life so well, gave their verdict against the use of alcoholic liquor, even as a medicine, and told us at length that there was no necessity for it as a remedy which could not be met by other remedies far less injurious and far more practical and healthful.

The defences against disease are broken down by those who use alcohol. If we take our soldiers, for instance, during hardships in camp and field, their likelihood of overcoming those hardships, their ability of full and effectual resistance is in proportion to their separation from the alcoholic liquor habit. The number of soldiers who die of diseases is generally far more than those who die of battle and of wounds, and the number who have died of disease has been largely

conditioned by those who have used alcoholic liquor in one or another form.

We are told that among the great desolations of France during this war is that which has been wrought upon her soldiery by tuberculosis; but we are assured from the investigations of twenty years on two continents, that the greatest cause of tuberculosis is alcoholic liquor as a beverage, and it has been said that this great white plague of tuberculosis can never be fought successfully until the use of alcohol as a beverage is eliminated.

Moderate drinking is practically as bad as free drinking. Its effect is just as realisable and as sure.

Moreover, of course, the workman or the soldier, the civilian or the man of the camp and the field, is effective in proportion to the vigour of his life and the number of days that he is capable of performing his tasks and his service; but we know that days of illness are multiplied, and loss of wages consequent to a greatly increased degree in the case of those who use alcoholic drink: $330,000,000, it was said five years ago, were lost from preventable diseases through inability to work, by the workingmen of this country in a single year. Nothing could more surely indicate the fact that if we want efficient service, the

maximum number of days of activity and of power, whether as soldiers or civilians, for the purposes of national defence, we shall secure the maximum number only by total abstinence from the use of intoxicating drink.

Have I said, if not, let me say it now—alcohol is not a medicine. Hospitals of Europe and America are proving it. They are using less and less of it; using less and less beer, less and less ale, more and more milk, and simple, nourishing liquids. The attitude of the doctors, which I cited a few moments ago, amounts to a demonstration, while the hospital practise which they carry out, shows the same results, and gives practical basis to their opinion.

One thing further: (although this is a very brief and incomplete survey), and that is, that accidents caused by alcohol are very numerous, and are readily preventable by abstinence, as they are readily traceable to alcoholic drink as a cause. Now, of course, the American soldier and sailor, as well as those of the allies (and this is distinctly understood abroad, as it is at home) has to be extremely careful in handling the implements of war. Many of them are chemicals of a highly explosive character; many of them are the refinement of mechanism, and they need the most extraordinary carefulness, precisely as the

handling of fine machinery in mills and factories needs it. The use of alcohol so distinctly causes, both in factory and in fort, the maximum of accidents, that no one can ignore a great fact like this without being entirely indifferent to the welfare of his country.

We know that some time ago when labour insurance was demanded by many state legislatures, the proprietors of factories and employers of men said: "Yes, we will insure our men and will pay damages, but we will not insure drinking men, nor pay damages to drunken men for accidents which they cause. They not only cause a vast amount of loss, but they cause a vast amount of personal damage to themselves." "Safety first" means total abstinence first, whether that be in the trenches or in the factories.

It is a noteworthy fact, obtained and proven by scientific temperance investigation, that the effect of a drink of alcohol, whether in beer or in some other form, comes to its maximum just about three hours after the drinker has taken the dose. For instance, a man taking a drink at seven o'clock on the way to his work, will experience the full force of that drink in losing his self-control, the co-ordination of his muscles, the intelligence of his mind, at about ten o'clock. If

weariness was the cause of accidents, then more accidents would occur nearer twelve o'clock, when the man was more weary; but it is just as truly noticed that at four o'clock in the afternoon, three hours from the time when the man has taken his drink at his lunch, the maximum of accidents occurs, as it is true that a similar condition occurs in the morning. In other words, the high curve of accidents is immediately traceable to the use of alcoholic beverages; and whoever expects either the American munition worker or shipbuilder, or navigator, or sailor, or soldier, to arrive at his best, to accomplish the highest and utmost purposes that the fine machinery on which he works can accomplish, has got to count on the fact that he must desist from the use of alcohol. We must keep it away from him. We must prohibit making it, or selling it, giving it away, or using it, in order that we may win this war.

The perils have not all been indicated; the proofs are not all in; the dangers have not all been stated. The magnitude of the victory depending on our right action is not greater than the irreparable ruin which will follow if we ignore these truthful warnings. I doubt not that liquor drinking had much to do with making this war, nor that it has added unmeasured ferocity to

German barbarities in sacked towns and on ruined peoples. To abolish it will win the war and do more than can be estimated toward preventing another.

IX

Our Victory Assured

"And this is the victory that overcometh the world; even our faith."

IN this war, who shall be victorious? We shall; we and our allies. Does it seem presumptuous to assume this knowledge of a great future event? Does anyone but the all-wise God know what is certain to be in the future? Our answer is: He knows, and we know as we know Him—from intuition, as He has given it to us, from faith and right reason, and from the study of history. On the basis of what we know of Him we are assured of victory in this war.

What is the object of our trust? Ourselves? No. Even though we are very much better prepared now than in 1914 and might, apparently, put a larger faith in our positions and forces than we formerly did. What gives us this confidence of victory? Right. What gives right its strength? God, who wills and so makes right; whose nature and law, whose administration, and whose purposes define Right. This leaves nothing vague or uncertain either in His nature or in our apprehension of it.

When the Apostle John affirmed: "This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith," he meant that God, the Author of right, of all law that makes for right, of all high goals and purposes, is the foundation of our confidence and our assurance of triumph. He meant the Christians' God, not some vague, uncertain idea of a world power imagined by men and constructed according to their selfish wishes; but that holy, just, righteous, fatherly, forgiving, guiding and good Being, whose nature embraces for us all that is desirable in human life and human relationships. There is only this one God. There is neither room nor place in the world for any other; and when we hear pagans, barbarians, and Germans calling upon a god of their own creation, who has no worshipful or deserving attributes, we know that such a being cannot be made the foundation of the hope of a righteous victory.

"The victory that overcometh the world is our faith." Our faith can be defined in two ways. We can speak of "our faith," meaning the object on which we rely, as the person, the laws, the principles which deserve our confidence. Then we can add to that this second idea of faith, our own act of trust by which we come into living connection with the external objects of our faith.

For example, I may say that my political faith is the Constitution of the United States. That is to say, that is the body of principles and laws upon which I rely as embracing the fullest measure of political sagacity, and social wisdom. When I take my oath of allegiance to the Constitution of the United States, I exercise my personal or subjective faith in that great body of laws. And so, my political faith embraces that in which I believe, and also my act of believing which attaches me to it.

This same idea is embraced in "the victory which overcometh the world" through our Christian faith; objectively, including the whole nature of God as revealed in Jesus Christ, and subjectively, embracing our act of trust and reliance upon Him.

Our faith, then, which overcomes, is the total of forces Divine, and external, on the one hand, and personal and internal on the other.

In this great war there are three parties: The assailants, the defenders, God. The assailants are those who brought it on by attacking an unsuspecting world. We are not they. The defenders are ourselves and our allies, who undertook to resist the assault of a fiendish and selfish power, seeking our overthrow. God is on one side or the other of this great conflict. He is

either with our assailants in attacking all that we defend, or with us as defenders, in protecting all that they assail.

The human party which is in alliance with God, must be victorious. By all we know of Him, with whom is His favour,—with the assailants or with the defenders? We are not boasting; we dare not boast of either present or prospective victory. We wish, we pray, we hope, we labour, we strive, and have so done.

But now we pass beyond these into a more assured realm. We claim and gain certainty on rational grounds of belief, as firm as the integrity of Nature, or of the human mind, or of the Divine government of the world, and on such a basis we declare our assurance, not merely our hope, that we shall win this war.

Let me consider the uncertainties which we have felt; the contingencies which have raised doubts in our mind as to who would be victorious. And then let me recount the certainties which for me dispel all doubt and give firm assurance as to the result.

First, the contingencies which have formerly raised uncertainty, apprehension and possible doubt in our minds—what are they? What, up to this time, has led us to be uncertain, possibly, as to an issue which we felt must be of victory?

I answer, the contingencies have been partly material and visible, and partly invisible and spiritual.

Among material contingencies which have raised doubts of our triumph in our mind, have been the mighty preparations and forces of the German-Austrian power. For many years they had prepared this stroke, gathering together all possible forces which could make for their advantage, while we had made no preparation and had assembled no counter powers. Surveying the multitude of their soldiers, contrasting them with the little armies of Belgium, of Britain, and of France; the immense quantity of their supplies in a thousand details; their large resources of knowledge of all the territory which they purposed to assail and conquer; their utmost readiness down to the very last item of preparation, and the amazing manifestation of physical force and strength of every sort with which they began their onslaught—and which they have kept up until this time—we have been almost overwhelmed with the quantity and energy of their resources. We have measured ourselves against them with daring, with courage, with hope, greater than our faith. And as we survey to-day what has been accomplished already by the mass of their powers, by the multitude of their forces,

by the enormous measure of their resources, we still sometimes raise the question whether we can victoriously combat these with an adequate defensive force. We count, we compare, we weigh, we estimate their forces, and feel a degree of uncertainty as to the outcome.

While this is true, there are also spiritual forces which make us dread the issue and wonder if we have a right to expect to succeed. The question we ask is: Are we in the right? Are we so surely right and they so wholly wrong that we are secure? And here, in humility and modesty, we have halted to make inquiry and to try and settle the matter truthfully in our minds. The student of history, studying the overthrow of nations, can but feel extremely careful when deciding on what rest the foundations of permanent existence for the land which he loves. Beholding the sins of nations on account of which they have ceased to exist, we have tried fairly and justly to inquire whether our national sins are such that God should scourge and reprove us, and perhaps overthrow us on account of them.

Taught as we have been by the sacred Scriptures, we have many times considered the story of the chosen people of God, the nation Israel, which regarded itself as favoured by Him, somewhat as we and other nations regard ourselves as

favoured by Him. And we have been compelled to observe that, notwithstanding their privileges, yet their sins, their disobedience, their neglected warnings, and their chastisements finally resulted in their captivity and overthrow. We remember how Babylon, a very wicked nation, was raised up to discipline the Hebrews, and conquering, to enslave them for a definite period of seventy years. Assyria is spoken of in the sacred history as "the rod of Mine anger," that is, of Jehovah's anger, indicating that even a worse nation might be used to scourge a better when that better one persistently violated the law of God and ignored its duties and its vows.

Then, we have seen emerge in the history of Israel those great prophets, the statesmen of their times, proclaiming the perils through sin, inhumanity, irreligion, idolatry, injustice and oppression, of the nation which they loved, warning them through a period of years, pleading with them and persuading them in vain, as they have shown the disasters sure to result from abuse of God's mercy. And we have said: "Are we dearer to God than ancient Israel? Are we surer that He will save us than they were that He would save them? Can we hope that He will deliver us from the just results of our sins?"

I confess that a vision of our national sins and of our possible overthrow has until lately, powerfully affected my mind. At the present time, on full and fair investigation, I see no reason to believe that we are in similar danger to that of the ancient Israelitish nation. For, first, while we recognise our national sins, we remember this: That there are and have always been in this country a multitude of most Godly and righteous citizens, whose prayers, whose faith, and whose obedience have continually appealed to God for mercy on the state. Of these there are millions, possibly a majority of the total of our citizens. Confessing our sins, which they have continually done, they have asked Divine mercy and favour, interceding for the entire people. It has been perfectly well known to all the best of our citizens that the way to be delivered from the consequences of our national sins was the way of repentance; that we should confess them, turn back from all evil doing, choose the right way, obtain mercy and pardon and so return to Divine favor.

That many millions of people in this country have been so continually right in their attitude toward God gives us great assurance. And they have very freely warned their fellow countrymen, while trying to improve in every respect our gen-

eral moral and social state. We know that even after repentance, a state has to expiate its sins; that the chastenings of God are applied to states and nations in this world; for since states have no existence beyond the grave, all in the way of discipline, or chastisement for their correction, must be applied to them in this present time.

We, therefore, behold ourselves in this present war as having sinned, repented of our sins, and to be now expiating our sins by what we are at present suffering. We have done wrong, which we confess. When those wrongs which we have done are compared with those of our enemies, they are apparently very small and trifling in a national or international sense. Nevertheless, we do not wish to hide from ourselves the fact that we have deserved the wrath of God. But in expiation of our sins, we are suffering, we have suffered, and I may say, we are ready to suffer. We own it to be just that we should endure chastisement and sorrow on account of the evil that we have done.

This attitude on our part of penitence, of prayer, of willingness to make expiation for national sins, argues most surely the certainty of Divine mercy and forgiveness. In this spirit could we be surer than now of God's favour? We are greatly and further assured by a contempla-

tion of our national spirit and attitude at this time, as by those of our allies.

II

If we compare ourselves, that is, our country and our allies on the one hand, and Germany on the other, what a totally different attitude toward God we allies have as contrasted with their foes. If I can honestly see that we are seeking and doing the will of God, even though we have sinned, I can be sure of His forgiveness, favour and aid, sure of His sanction and of victory. And as I behold our nation and our associated and allied nations, I see that our choices have been wholly unlike those of our foes.

We have chosen for our God, the true God, the God of fatherly goodness, of holiness, of righteousness, of mercy, of pity and of love.

Compare the selected object of our worship with that horrible, characterless, fierce, immoral, ferocious being that the Germans have named God, *Might,* without moral character. If nations ever suffered desolation because of wicked worship of false idols, then Germany is likely to suffer thus in this age; and if nations of old found their chief strength in obedience to the true and living God, then our strength is assured from our choice of Him to be our God.

Compare us in another respect with our assailants. We have chosen the merciful course of life, not the cruel course of tyrants and oppressors. They struck Belgium down, crushed, ravaged, massacred, tortured and starved this little people. We, on the other hand, fed them, uplifted them, bound up their wounds, comforted them, rehabilitated them, adopted them into our homes; have done everything indicative of the most merciful attitude of mind. Can anyone doubt whether the true and living God is on the side of the spoilers of Belgium, Serbia, Armenia, or on the side of those who have poured millions on millions of dollars, hundreds on hundreds of workers, and relief of every kind into those suffering countries?

We announced, and it is known that our announcement is true, that we would with our power, aid the nations by love. They announced that they would rule by frightfulness. They seek to horrify a trembling world. We seek to comfort a suffering world. We would emancipate the world from slavery of every type. They would enslave it. Out of such enslavement they would draw their riches and revenues. We, on the other hand, seek only justice and kindness among men, and the uplift of all types of human society at our own expense.

They, putting forth robbers' hands, would

seize and keep all kinds of treasures not their own, as plunder. We would take nothing from the weak but would give of what we have and so restore to those who need what the wicked have plundered from them. Our enemies burn for conquest regardless of justice or right. We urge justice and generosity, and in fact have thrown ourselves into this war with the distinct understanding that the vindication of justice and of liberty is our chief purpose and our only effort.

In a word, we are on the Christian side with God, (the loving and merciful God, the only God; the true and living God) in all these respects. Because we are on His side, because we stand with Him, we not only have hope, but we have certainty. When He is defeated, we shall be conquered; not till then. If we were overthrown in our present spirit and service, then He would be dethroned, and the world would be a Godless and chaotic world. Fighting, we have put right and justice in the field against wrong and cruelty.

In these main lines we are doing the will of God, and because we are doing the will of God, which is Right as God made it, which is Law as God made it, all uncertainty passes away as to the issue, as to whether He favours us or not. That He favours us we are as sure as that He ex-

ists, and that that favour means victory is as certain as that His name is a Just and Holy name. He as the object of our faith is the victory which overcomes the evil world forces. So in the consideration of the contingencies and uncertainties which may hitherto have caused us to doubt, whether the material powers of our adversaries, or whether the possibility of our own weakness through our own failure or sin, those contingencies have passed away, and we have no more reason to doubt on either basis.

III

As a second general proposition; Our certainties are assuring to us victory. Among those certainties is this: Not one selfish, Godless or unchristian purpose inspires us to battle. Selfishness, self-worship, is the root of all sins and the ruin of human life. You may look in vain to find one single evidence of a selfish purpose in America or in her allies in carrying on this war. The enemy has nothing that we desire, neither territory nor wealth, nor influence. Those whom we are defending and for whom we are fighting have nothing that we want. Appealing to our sense of universal justice, we wish them to have what is

their right. There is not a trace of selfishness in our purpose, as we carry on this struggle.

On the other hand, there is not one unselfish or loving purpose which has visibly moved our enemies. Surveying the history of these four years, or of many years before, or the purposes that are disclosed as likely to control the German-Austrian hordes for years to come, I find no trace, promise or suggestion from them of an unselfish purpose in anything that they do. They mean no good to anyone but themselves, no advantage to any but themselves. Any desolating scourge, any horrifying abuse that will seem to them to minister to their advantage, they will put upon those whom they are trying to overwhelm and enslave. The greed of goods and the lust of power seem to be all that move them; while absolute good will toward all mankind is all that moves us.

For further proof that the certainties in the case assure us victory, I beg you to notice among our aims, that we are striving for the universal fraternity of humanity, to make a brotherhood of all races, nations, tongues, and peoples; that for men to live in less than fraternal kindness is to live below our standard and our level, and for the privilege on the part of all humanity to live as brothers, we are making this mighty struggle.

We are contending in the interests of all nations, with their varied forms of governments, as far as those governments are beneficent and helpful. We are endeavoring to mitigate the troubles and sorrows of all sufferers. We are trying to deliver from every kind of pain and distress all races, ranks and conditions of mankind. Every gracious thing in character which would make for good neighbourhood, for peacefulness, for prosperity, for kindness and for goodwill, we have put upon our banner as the purpose of our strife. For homes, in all their sweetness and preciousness, we are making the most energetic defence, building again where they have torn down, remaking where they have been destroyed. All women and little children, all aged and weak, are the objects of our help, and the subjects of our striving. Even God Himself, we say with profoundest reverence, has prescribed no higher aims for human welfare than we have literally claimed and undertaken to realise in the interests of mankind. And all of these high aims and purposes are in direct contradistinction, and antagonism to the acts, purposes, deeds and history of our enemies.

Beyond all doubt, our pure motives and purposes have received upon them the Divine sanction. God could not express Himself in antag-

onism to what we are doing. It is so entirely in harmony with His will and His nature as Christ has revealed Him, as to assure His favour.

Now what is the assurance that comes to right reason when we see how our aims agree with those of the Divine Being? What does this concord assure us in regard to victory or defeat? There can be but one answer. Victory must be given us.

If we turn to the history of our country during the great epoch of the Civil War, we may find an illustration of the manner in which God blesses a nation which has a humane goal and purpose.

You remember, to sketch it very briefly, that in 1861 and 1862, we fought for the Union of the states. Mr. Lincoln stated that he would save the Union with slavery, if he could; without it, if he must. The Confederacy fought for a political theory of the rights of states and of the federation of such states. So, in fighting merely for the Union, did the northern United States.

Underlying all this, and to a great degree ignored by us during two years of war, was the great question of the rights of man, of what should be done for that human being in this country who was denied all human rights. This we relegated to the background and we fought on, not blindly, but unsuccessfully, toward the

realisation of our political goal. But defeat followed defeat with us who stood for the Union.

On the other side there was at first the advantage of material resources, very like those of the Central Powers when this war began. The United States army had been made weak and scattered, its navy dispersed to all parts of the world, its credit destroyed, its arsenals where they could be most easily seized upon by the enemies of the nation. They had every advantage at the beginning; and defeat after defeat followed the efforts of the Union arms.

Profoundly impressed with the succession of disasters, relieved only now and then by victory, Mr. Lincoln with deep seriousness and with much prayer to the living God, sought light as to what his duty was concerning the emancipation of the slave; and at length, when the forces of the Confederacy were marching apparently victorious, upon Washington in 1862, he promised God, as he himself says, that if the battle was won and the southern forces compelled to flee, he would issue a proclamation for the emancipation of the slave. On the 17th of September, 1862, the battle of Antietam was fought, issuing in a Union victory; on the 22nd of September, Mr. Lincoln issued the proclamation that on the first

day of January, 1863, a hundred days from then, the slaves should be free.

Still, success did not at once crown the Union arms. The issue of the strife was now cleared very much. Great forces fought against the idea of humanity on the one side, while other great forces on the other side aligned themselves in favour of the humane goal to issue in the manhood of the enslaved and emancipated. But as it became more and more evident that the power of the Union arms was devoted to the emancipation of man, the tide of success turned, and on the fourth day of July, 1863, Vicksburg fell. On the same day Gettysburg was won, and the victorious end of the war was assured. It was with the nation a case of a change of purpose and goal in the midst of the war, from a political to a humane basis, and on that change of creed, which was the transference of our faith from political methods to divine purposes—I say on the strength of that faith, the great final victory was won. No one had any doubt, from that time on, of the assured triumph of the Union arms. We had taken God's side.

It might be said, I think, with exact truth, that "the victory which overcame" in the Civil War was "our faith"; that great mass of belief and principles, of revelation of the Christian God, the

true and living God, which could not sanction or stand for the enslavement of man; and that when the change took place in us, then victory became for us a certainty.

Now, at this present time, a different state of things appeals to us, altogether in our favour. We began this war without a political goal. We began it with an absolutely humane purpose. We did not need to change our creed after we began the war. The "victory which could overcome the world," namely, "our faith," our living faith in these humane and eternal purposes of a true and living God, was from the very first assured. We have never swerved from it; we have never wavered in it. We are in this war for principle; we are in this war for humanity. We are in this war for morality, for Christianity, for God. We have no occasion to change, and if it has been the method of Divine Providence to accord victory to those who have modified their purposes from a political to a humane objective, then much more now, when no modification is necessary, it becomes certain beyond all question or controversy that we are fighting in behalf of God, on God's side. And from all that we know of His character, we are sure of success, the success of His cause.

We verify our love of God by our love of men.

We love our neighbours as ourselves. We expect Him to vindicate that principle, and we know that we shall triumph with Him. Christian spirit and Christian influence are ascendent in the allied world. We smite to heal; we fight to make peace; we have no pride which we wish crowned; we have no hate which we wish to indulge; we have no selfish desire which we wish to gratify. We seek to have the will of the loving God, done by Him on the earth as it is in heaven, and by men, as learning His will and becoming obedient thereto.

IV

Thus by our faith and our personal trust we are assured victory. I wish in the strongest possible manner to affirm, not that we hope for victory merely, not that we think we shall be victorious, not that as in the language of some earnest patriots, "We must conquer"; but rather I wish to say that we do conquer; we are conquering, we shall conquer; and that our defeat is impossible.

President Lincoln, now so deservedly honoured, when asked: "Do you think God is on our side?" is said to have answered: "I am more concerned that we should be on His side." Mr.

Lincoln if here now could not but be pleased in the highest degree, as every Christian and every thinker ought to be, to find that beyond all question we are on God's side. It is no more a question of defeat of the allies, or of victory for the Central Powers. It is a question of the defeat of God or Satan, of the victory of Heaven or Hell; of the triumph of right or wrong; of the substantial eternity of goodness or wickedness; and whoever doubts what the result is sure to be in this case, can have no faith in anything good.

We do not want victory unless we ought to have it. This statement may startle some of you who hear it, at the moment, but upon reflection you will absolutely agree with me. If our victory was to make the world unhappy, if it was to depress and degrade, if it was to override right and truth and justice, if it was to enslave humanity; if our victory was to destroy civilisation; if it was to remit the world to ancient slavery again, we would not wish it. Our principle is wholly different from this. Because we know that it is God's victory, we do want it. We are ready to say, "Thine, O Lord, is the victory," because all the victory that we want is a victory that could be presided over by the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, by such a Deity

as is expressed in the character, the words, the spirit and the work of Jesus Christ.

So then, we shall win this war, we and our allies. We are certain of it on bases broader than mere national boundaries. It is not a question of the geographical measurements of territory; it is a question of the moral measurements of the universe. If this universe is under control of an infinitely beneficent Being, then we are sure to win. If the control of this universe were under a maleficent being, a being of evil will, which is unthinkable, then we might possibly be defeated.

The forces on which we depend are more numerous than millions of soldiers, more powerful than the greatest aggregate of numbers that can be put into the fight. The forces on which we depend are the forces of the spirit. Germany called Belgium's army and Britain's army "contemptible;" 300,000 of the one; 250,000 of the other were thought to be no enemy to fear at all. But Germany forgot to reckon among the mighty forces that invincible spirit which transformed the 250,000 of Britain into 5,000,000 within four years, and which awakened other millions in America and lifted up Belgium, France and Italy to the heights of national martyrdom and glory.

We depend on constructive agencies, more powerful than the destructive inventions of any age. Chemistry, physics, gunnery, piracy, may all combine with the high intelligence of devilish ingenuity in German hands to destroy. We hold in the spirit and purpose of our work a constructive force much greater than all these destructive forces. Putting one against the other, we remember that the humble Cross of Calvary became mightier than all the armed hosts of the Roman Empire, which was contemporary with it. We depend on a Divine leadership exalted above all civil, military and naval commanders. We honour the leaders of the allied forces. We doubt not that among our own Americans will go forth men who will become renowned through ages for their courage, their humanity, and their devotion. But the Leadership on which we depend is higher than any general staff, any agencies of war, any consulting generals or military men. We depend on the leadership which alone can keep this world from utter chaos and ruin; on the leadership that will uphold goodness when badness is destroyed, that will make love greater than hate, that will make brotherhood greater than antagonism, that will make humanity at its best, greater than all the ambitious and fierce selfishness of the powers of the wicked.

There is nothing visible in the realm of human thought that can take away our victory. So long as we continue to fight on God's side, as we now do, there is nothing conceivable that can give victory to our enemies, excepting that we should become by any means as base as they, which may God forbid.

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY
REFERENCE DEPARTMENT

This book is under no circumstances to be taken from the Building

JAN 22 1919
JAN 22 1919
JAN 26 1919
JAN 28 1919
JAN 14 1919
JAN 15 1919
JAN 16 1919
JAN 21 1919

form 48